

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
REMARKS
ON THE
BISHOP of *DERRY*'s
DISCOURSE
ABOUT
Human Inventions,

From what is
Objected against them in the *Ad-*
monition annex to the Second Edi-
tion of that Discourse.

By the Author of the REMARKS.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *John Lawrence* at the Sign of the
Angel in the *Poultry*. 1695.

T

C

th
M

pe
of

in
in

an
th

p.
re

de
as

te
st

gr
se

ti
as

ga
M

pr
ar

as
th

To the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocese of DERRY.

Since the Bishop of Derry has been pleas'd in his late Admonition to You, almost wholly to wave the Argument between Us, and to turn this Debate about your Worship into a Dispute about Matters of Fact; nay, since he has frequently appeal'd to your own Consciences for the Truth of what he has said concerning you, acknowledging, That it wou'd be odd for him to think of imposing on you in matters you know so well, and that he can only hope to prevail on you by the Integrity of what he saith, [See Admonition, p. 141, 148, 158, 159, 187, 188.] I thought I cou'd not reasonably refuse to concur with him in referring the decision of this part of our Controversie to your selves, as the most competent and proper Judges, the Matters controverted relating to your own or your Ministers publick practices. And I may do it with the greater assurance, because you'll find all that I now assert attested by your own Ministers, (besides the particulars relating to your Communion attested by such as are Elders, or principal Members in your Congregations.) And as they must doubtless know these Matters better than the Bishop can do, who is never present at their Worship; so I may justly presume they are not so prodigal of their Reputation to the World, as to avouch so many things as True, which all their Hearers cou'd convict 'em of Falshood in, if they

To the Dissenting Inhabitants of Derry.

were not. I confess 'tis something hard that the Bishop shou'd thus put 'em to this double labour, of proving their Practice by Affidavits, as well as defending it by Arguments. But when one is once engag'd with such unreasonable Disputants, there is no declining even such drudgery as this. For since the things which the Bishop objects against you are such as himself supposes, will prove scandalous to all that profess Christianity, If those Objections be founded on palpable mis-reports of your Practice, sure the just esteem of so many Christian Pastors and Churches deserves a modest Vindication. And indeed this Vindication had not been deferr'd so long, if the multiplicity of the Particulars to be enquir'd into had not retarded it beyond expectation; and your Ministers were unwilling to run into so many Mistakes as the Bishop has unhappily done, by giving too hasty accounts of these Matters upon slight Informations. I shall therefore freely leave this part of our Debate (which now lies between the Bishop and your own Ministers) to your impartial Examination. And that those excellent Churches you are Members of, may under the vigilant care of such laborious Pastors, improve their external Rest and Peace, by walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, and thereby be both edify'd and multiply'd, is the hearty desire of

Dear Brethren,

Your affectionate Brother

and Servant in our

common Lord

J. B.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Remarks, &c.

In this Admonition of the Bishops we may consider the Introduction, The Three Heads he proposes to give an Account of: And The Reflections he adds on some Passages in the Remarks.

IN the Introduction his Lordship is pleas'd to insinuate, tho' he does not venture directly to assert, *That I have treated the Opinions and Practices of the established Church in a passionate and angry, in a scoffing and deriding manner.* But since he has given no instances or proof of it, but refer'd it to the Reader's judgment, I shall with some confidence appeal to it also, as being well assur'd of the innocence of those Papers as to this particular. Only, since he alledges a passage in his Discourse against this way of treating Controversies, I hope I may take the liberty of reciting one of my own, wherein I had taken care to obviate this Objection. 'Tis *Remarks*, p. 142. 'I do fully concur with him in his Advice, Not to treat one another

*Admon. Obedience
Edit. p. 134.*

ther with scurrilous and unseemly Reflections ; but I hope he will not account those such wherein a Man is justly reprov'd for gross mis-representations of other Men's Opinions or Practices, or a trifling Argument is not always treated with grimace, but sometimes with the slight it deserves. Let but the Reader make me this reasonable allowance, and I shall not be very fearful of his censure on this account.

For the Three Heads which the Bishop proposes to give an account of relating to the Remarks, I shall examine 'em in their order.

I. He acquaints us with the true Motive that prevailed with him to publish his Book, in which these particulars are suggested.

1. He tells us how much Ignorance he found among the poor People, *inasmuch, as of 800 or more of the Dissenters Communion, whom he personally discourt, Admon. p. 135. he found not above four persons that cou'd give any account of their Catechism, and only two that cou'd repeat it.*

Now as to this matter of fact which the Bishop professes mov'd his compassion, I shall give him the Account sent me by the Dissenting Ministers that are in his Diocese, and I hope that Christian Charity which he so often professes, will render it very welcome to him, by assuring him that the generality of 'em are not so ignorant as he has mistaken 'em to be.

We can give no Account how many persons the Bishop has examin'd, but we know several whom he did examine that had the Assemblies Catechism, and could both give an account of it and repeat it, but would not, partly because they heard him so enveigh against it, that they judg'd he question'd 'em rather to affront than edifie 'em ; and partly because they were not free to subject themselves to an Examination he pretended to make as their Pastor. But to evidence how little ground he had to suppose 'em so generally ignorant of their Catechism. If we may be allow'd to judge of other Congregations in the Diocese by those two in the Parish of *Temple more* (alias *Derry*) where he resides

resides, and may be suppos'd to have examin'd the greatest number. We can on good grounds affirm there are in those two Congregations 600 who can give a good account of and repeat the Assembly's Catechism : And we know of few in any of our Congregations that cannot repeat the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.

Now if this Account of their own *Ministers*, who should be best acquainted with their own People, be true, the Bishop's Account is absolutely incredible, unless he has taken some extraordinary pains to pick out the most ignorant Dissenters of his Diocese, that by them he might pretend to judge of the rest. But any one that considers the genius of that People, and their particular dissatisfaction with his Lordship, will be easily inclin'd to believe this genuine Account of the Matter ; That he has mistaken their *Silence* for their *Ignorance*, and concluded they could not repeat their *Catechism*, because they would not admit him to be their *Catechizer*.

2. 'He computes, that there being but nine Meetings in the Diocese, (and taking one Meeting-house and one Lord's-day *Admon.* p. 136. with another) not 300 at each Meeting, and there being 30000 Dissenters in the Diocese, it may be thence concluded, that only one in ten, or thereabouts, go to worship God any where on the Lord's-day. And this he professes was a great grief to him.

Now as to this matter of fact, I hope the Bishop cannot take it unkindly that I endeavour to allay his grief, by offering him the following Account from the Dissenting Ministers in his Diocese,

'In the Parish of *Temple-more*, alias *Derry*, there are two Meetings, in which there will be found above 2400. who ordinarily worship God every Lord's-day. For tho' every one of these does not attend every Lord's-day, because some of 'em must be left to secure their houses, yet these and more are ordinary Hearers, as the Ministers of those two Congregations

‘ can undeniably prove by their Examination Rolls
 ‘ Nay, the least Congregation among us are ordinarily
 ‘ 600, and some above a 1000, that do worship God
 ‘ every Lord’s-day together. So that where Ministers
 ‘ are settled in Parishes, we do not know of one in 20,
 ‘ that do not ordinarily attend on publick worship. And
 ‘ for those which the Bishop saith have not been at any
 ‘ publick worship these seven years, we know none such
 ‘ of our Communion. And for those places that are
 ‘ not furnisht with Ministers, the Ministers that are set-
 ‘ led supply ’em as frequently as their work in their own
 ‘ Congregations can allow.

Now if this Account be true, the Bishop’s Computa-
 tion, and the Conclusion he draws from it, is far en-
 ough from being so. And that there are yet some
 Congregations that want Ministers, and can only have
 occasional supplies, is much more their grief, who are
 doing all they can to remedy it, than it can be supposed
 to be his Lordship’s, who does all he can to lessen the num-
 ber of their Meetings, by obliging his Tenants to suffer
 neither Ministers nor Meeting-houses to be upon his Land.

3. ‘ The Bishop pretends that his Book contains an
 Answer to what he found objected by

Admon. p. 137. ‘ those of the Dissenters, that he con-
 vers’d with against the ordinary Lords-
 ‘ day worship in the establish’d Church, and that he con-
 fin’d himself to what he had seen and known to be
 ‘ their Opinion and Practice.

Ans. ‘Tis evident by Mr. Craghead’s Reply to his
 Discourse, which Taxes him with the same Calumnies
 as the Remarks, that if those Dissenters he Convers’d
 with, gave him that Account he pretends of these mat-
 ters; they were such as understood not the known Op-
 inions or Practices of their own Teachers. As when they
 alledg’d so many Reasons either against the lawfulness of all
 Forms of Prayer, and against joyning in publick worship
 where they are us’d, or against the publick reading the
 Scriptures, or against all bodily worship, &c. And therefore
 if the Bp. had been ingenious in prosecuting what he now
 saith was his design, he should have told us, that he intended
 only

only by this Book to Correct the mistakes of a few Ignorant People, that neither knew the Judgment of their Pastors, nor the common Practise of the Congregations they Joyned with. And that he intended not to charge the generality of the Dissenters, even not thole of his own Diocess with those weak Opinions, and weaker Arguments and Objections which he endeavours to censure and confute. But he has been so far from doing this, that tho in the Conclusion of his Book, he particularly Addresses himself to those of his Diocess; yet in his very Entrance on his Subject, he undertakes to represent the Practise of *Dissenters* in general, or (in his own terms) *of them that differ* from the Establish't Church. Nay, Where he supposes his charge only to be true of those in the North of Ireland, he takes care to confine it to them; and therefore he gives us just ground to conclude, that where he mentions the Dissenters without any such Restriction, he is to be understood as speaking of the whole Body of them, according to the very Titles of his several Chapters, *Praise, Prayer, Hearing, Bodily Worship, how practis'd among Dissenters*. And to Convince him of the Reasonableness of this, I shall put a Parallel case to him. Suppose I should write a Book about Ecclesiastical Discipline, how Practis'd in the Establish't Church, and among Dissenters; and in the Account of the Practise of the Establish't Church, should represent the sad neglect of all the Duties of their Function, both by Bishops and Priests; and accordingly should charge the Bishops with so many years Non-residence, in which there had been no Consecration of Churches, nor Confirmation of Children, nor Ordination of Priests, and the Priests with such neglect of their Cures, as a great many in the Diocess of *Down and Connor* were Accus'd of: And suppose I should particularly address this Book to the late Bishop and Clergy of that Diocess, Would his Lordship in this case think me Excuseable from the guilt of Calumniating, because I had particularly address'd this Discourse to them, when I have not in the Body of the Book confin'd my Accusations to them, but

but speak all along of the faults of the Conformable Bishops and Clergy in general, without any such particular limitation, or would he think me Ingenuous in producing such Arguments, as the Bishop and Clergy of the forementioned Diocess may alledge to excuse themselves, as the common Reasonings of the Conforming Clergy : And yet, this were of the two more justifiable than the Bishop's management of this Charge against Dissenters, in which he has wronged the generality; even of those to whom he now pretends that this Discourse was confined, but much more the generality of the Dissenters, against whom the greatest part of his Book is levell'd without any Distinction. I confess, to have told us plainly, that he only Confuted the weak Discourses he had met with among some few of the Dissenting Laity, would have lessened the Character of his Book, by supposing the cause of the Dissenters to be little concerned in it; and so probably the main Design of it, to blast the Reputation of the whole Party had been frustrated, by such an ingenuous Confession. But without such an ingenuous Confession, I do not see how 'tis possible to excuse his Discourse from untruth and dissingenuity; either in attributing to Dissenters in general, what is peculiar to those in the North of Ireland (as in the Head of Frequent Communion) or in ascribing to a whole Party without distinction, so many Opinions, Arguments and Practises, as either none at all, or none but very Weak and Ignorant People are chargeable with; of which there are so many to be found in all Perswasions, that he who will measure the rest of their Communion by them, can never want matter enough to expose the Wisest and Soberest Body of Christians whatsoever. So that should we allow the truth of all his Lordship here suggests, (*viz.* that he truly represents what the Dissenters he Convers't with alledged to him.) It appears how little this signifies to clear him from the guilt of groundless Aspersions.

II. The Bishop proposes to shew,
That I have granted the principal things Admon. p. 128.
designed in his Book.

As to these I assure him, That I see no reason to retract any of those Concessions I have really made; and if they will be of any use to reconcile sober Protestants to more charitable thoughts of each others Worship, I shall rejoyce in it. But then I must desire him not to stretch them beyond their just Bounds, as he seems to do in the following Particulars.

Thus, Tho I have own'd Singing in Prose (as opposed strict to Metre,) lawful in general, p. 10—yet as to the Practise of it in Cathedrals, whereby the main part of the Auditory is excluded from joyning in the publick Praises, through their incapacity to Sing them in Prose; I have censur'd it as disagreeable to the Apostle's Rule, of doing all to Edification, p. 23.

So, Tho I have granted Responses in general lawful, yet I have censured the method of them in the Parish-Churches as applied to all Psalms, as not only unscriptural but unreasonable and disorderly, p. 23.

As to the 4th Concession, Tho I think not those unscriptural Practises of Singing Psalms by a Quire, and of Responses in the Parish-Churches, to fall within the compass of what our Lord Censures, 7 Mark. 7. yet I think them a very defective and disorderly way of Worship; to which I judge the more Scriptural way practis'd among the Dissenters far preferable.

For the 5th Concession. Tho I grant, Praying with or without a Form in general undetermined in Scripture, yet I do not think it only a matter of Conveniency: For I doubt not Praying with a Form is a Duty, to those who cannot Pray without it; and I think 'tis sinful to exclude necessary matters of Prayer by confining our selves to a Form, when we can Pray without one.

From Concession the 6th he draws a wrong Inference, which I had particularly obviated; viz. That because God prescribed a Form of Words to the Jews, in some extraordinary parts of Worship, therefore he does in particular command Christian Pastors and their

Flocks

Flocks to Pray to him in Forms, for that must be the sense of his Lordship's Inference, if it be any thing to his purpose : For I have challeng'd him to produce any Form prescribed to the Christian Church except the Lord's Prayer, or any particular Command for the constant use of that in publick ; and for its being sometimes us'd as a Form, the *Westminster-Assembly* in their larger Catechism, declare their Judgment for it.

For Concession the 8th, I do not own (as his Lordship here alledges) that there is no reading of Scripture in the North of Ireland in the Winter Quarter ; for tho this Exercise is in some places forborn during the Winter Quarter, yet it is not in all, and particularly but in one Meeting in all his Lordship's Diocess, the rest continuing it through the whole Winter ; of which I shall have occasion to take notice afterwards.

For Concession the 9th, Tho I have owned that Bodily Worship is commanded in Scripture ; yet I have not owned, but Censured it as practis'd by such as bow towards the East, or Altar, or at the Name of Jesus.

For Concession the 10th, Tho I do not condemn kneeling in the Act of Receiving as unlawful, yet I have shewed it to be disagreeable to Scripture Example, and by the strictness of the Bishop's own Rule unlawful to, p. 123.

The third thing the Bishop proposes, is to shew, *That whereas there are several matters of Fact which he affirms, and I deny ; the mistake lyes on my side, notwithstanding I impute them to him with great assurance as falsehoods, &c.*

Ans. What I have charged him with as untruths, in reference to the *Dissenters in general*, it lies on me to make good ; what relates to those in the North of Ireland, as I have asserted nothing but upon their Information, so I can produce no other vouchers than themselves : And sure I need not produce any other, since their Testimony concerning their own Practise, must by all reasonable Men be allowed to be of greater weight and credit than his Lordship's, who cannot pretend

tend to know so well as themselves what is done by themselves.

This premis'd I come to examine the matters of Fact, wherein the Bishop attempts to vindicate himself, tho they are but a small part of what I have charged him with Misrepresenting.

For the two first matters of Fact, I shall take the liberty to offer them in the same order, and in the very words of his Discourse, p. 83, 84. *Edit. Quarto.*

'But the most sad and deplorable defect of your performance of this Duty, is the casting out the reading of the word of God from most of your publick Assemblies, directly contrary to God's Institution and Ordinance for the Instruction of his Church; insomuch, that in many of your Meetings, setting aside a Verse or Two for a Text or Quotation at the Discretion of the Teacher, the Word of God is never publicly heard among them; this is matter of Fact and undeniable. And in all the Meetings of the North of Ireland, in a whole year perhaps there is not so much Scripture read as in one Day in our Church, by the strictest Enquiry I could make, *Disc. p. 83, 84. And ib. p. 84.* The Dissenters banish the word of God out of their Meetings.—Sure 'tis a sad thing, That a Man may go to most Meetings many years, and never hear one entire Chapter read in them.

'Tis here obvious, That his main and positive Accusation is, That the Dissenters have cast the reading of the Word of God out of most of their Meetings, That setting aside a verse or two for a Text or Quotation at the Discretion of the Teacher, the Voice of God is in many of them never publicly heard among them: And that a Man may go to most Meetings many years, and never hear one entire Chapter read in them; and this Accusation he more particularly fixes on the Meetings in the North of Ireland.

In opposition to this Accusation I had told him, 'Tis the general Practice of the Dissenting Ministers in the North of Ireland, for about three

Remarks, p. 92.

93.

quarters

quarters of the year, (for in the most, the Winter quarter is only excepted) to read every Morning an entire portion of Scripture, usually a whole Chapter, at least so much of one as they can go thro with in an Exposition of half an hours length.

The very same matter of Fact; The Reverend Mr. *Craghead* has affirmed in his Answer, and more largely, without excepting the Winter Quarter, since in his Diocels all the Dissenting Ministers except one continue their Lecturing thro the whole year.

Now this matter of Fact all the World must allow to be directly contrary to his severe charge; so that if it prove true, His Lordship could have no pretence to complain of my Reproving him, for offering such barefaced untruths for undeniable matters of Fact.

Let's then enquire what he hath said to make good his Charge, and to that purpose he alledges Two Things.

1. That the Reading the Scriptures should be so ordered; That the diligent Hearers may in a competent time be acquainted with the whole Body of them; Whereupon he challenges me to produce one Meeting in the North where *Almon. p. 144.* this has been observed.

Ans. As to this Allegation, 'tis evident, That it concerns not the matter of Fact in Dispute at all, which is, Whether setting aside a verse or two for a Text or Quotation at the discretion of the Teacher, the voice of God is never publickly heard among them, and a Man may attend most Meetings many years, and never hear an entire Chapter read in them. For the Allegation concerns only the manner of Reading them, whereas the Accusation supposes them not Read at all, except a verse or two for a Text or Quotation, &c. so that I might justly dismiss any farther Consideration of it; but since the Bishop gives me this occasion to compare their Practice and ours, I shall suggest to him, That tho we Read not so much of Scripture as they in such entire Portions as whole Chapters, yet we Read the Scriptures more regularly then they, and a Man may sooner hear them Read

Read through in a *Meeting*, than he can in most of the *Parish-Churches*. To clear this I must premise, That in the generality of the *Parish-Churches* through the Kingdom, there is no Divine Service Read except on *Sundays*; Now if we consult the *Calender* in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, we shall find, That (excepting the *Psalms*) there is never read from one generation to another, but about 104 Chapters of the *Old Testament*, and that in such order or rather disorder, as breaks the Coherence of the Sacred History: So that a Man may if he lived to 80 years, attend the Publick Worship in most *Parish-Churches* all his Days, and never hear the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th Chapter of *Gen.* and so on. Set the Lessons proper for *Sundays*; and how is the *New Testament* Read? This *Sunday* we have the *Matt.* 1. and the *Rom.* 1. Read; the next *Sunday* the 8th of each, and next 15th. Four Months hence the 3d of *Matt.* and the 4th of *Rom.* So that in the generality of the *Parish-Churches*, the Scriptures are Read most confusedly; so that the Hearers are incapable of observing the admirable Connexion of its parts; and in most *Parishes*, the far greater part of them is never read at all: Whereas in the Meetings, 'tis the general Practice to Read on a Book in order; and tho their Exposition hinder them from Reading so large a Portion, (for which there is abundant Compensation by their Expounding what is read from Parallel places of Scripture) yet they will in the course of some years be read all over, which they never are nor can be, in the generality of the *Parish-Churches* that are shut all the Week. But as this first Allegation had it been true, signifies nothing to the purpose 'tis brought for, so let us see whether the other be more considerable.

2. The Bishop Appeals to our selves, *Whether any of our Ministers ever read one Portion of Scripture, but what was either designed for a Text to a Lecture or Sermon or a Quotation.* If any one pretend the contrary, he desires me to name the time and place that he may reprove those *reformers*, which I affirm have so grossly imposed on him; but till the time and place be named, his Assertion he saith is

Admon. p. 144.

literally

literally true, and in a larger sense then he expressed it.

Ans. I must desire his Lordship to review this passage and tell us, *Whether it be literally true, that except a verse or two for a Text or Quotation, the voice of God is never publicly heard in their Meetings, when 'tis* (as Mr. Craghead informs him) *their ordinary Practice to Lecture every Lord's Day, and usually to Read a whole Chapter, or divide a long one that's full of Textual difficulties. Is a whole Chapter or half a long one, only a verse or two for a Text? Nay is it literally true, That a Man may go to most Meetings many years, and never Hear an entire Chapter Read, when in the generality of them he shall most commonly Hear a whole one Read every Lord's Day? But what does he mean, when he challenges me to name the time and place in which any entire Portion of Scripture was Read, but what was either designed for a Text to a Lecture or a Sermon? What is this to the matter of Fact that he Asserted? For besides that a Text to a Lecture is a new Phrase; Is a whole Chapter or half a long one, only a verse or two? Or is a whole Chapter never Read, because 'tis always read with a design to Expound it? Nay, is this so deplorable a fault as he has suppos'd it, that we never Read an entire Portion of Scripture without intending to illustrate the sense of it, by comparing parallel Scriptures with it? (for that's all his Lordship can mean, by making it a Text to a Lecture) Is it not rather our great commendation, That the Scripture is always Interpreted as well as Read, and rather matter of Reproach to others that 'tis barely Read, without giving the People such help to understand it? And shall our extraordinary diligence be made our deplorable crime, and their sloth so great a virtue? And upon the whole, would it not have been more ingenuous in him to own that his Informers had grossly imposed upon him, then to persist in so plain a mistake, and then colour it over with an Apology, the weakness and unreasonableness whereof had been so largely and justly exposed in that part of the Remarks, to which he has not yet thought fit to give any Answer?*

But

52.

But tho' the Bishop be in the wrong, as to the Substance of the Accusation, he seems very confident of what he has said to vindicate that Circumstance of it, viz. That in all the Meetings of the North, in a whole year, perhaps there is not so much Scripture read as in one day in the establish'd Church. This he pretends to prove so fully, that by his Computation there appears to be four times more Scripture read in the establish'd Church, than in all the Meetings of the North. To this purpose he pretends to take my own Computation of half a Chapter read in each Meeting for three quarters of a year; and so in the nine Meetings in his Diocese he computes 17½ Chapters and a half to be read in a year.

On the other hand, He computes 11 Psalms and 5 Chapters, and so in all 16 Chapters read in the 42 Parishes in his Diocese, *Adm. p. 142,* and consequently in all 672 every Lord's-day.

This Computation at first view looks like Demonstration, but is indeed liable to manifold and just Exceptions.

1. The Bishop here puts that sense on his words that was not the plain and obvious meaning of 'em.

Their obvious sense is, That there is as much Scripture read in every Parish-Church in one Lord's-day, as in all the Meetings in the North in a year. And there was good reason to suppose he intended 'em in this sense, both because 'tis but the same Chapters are read in every Parish-Church thro' the Kingdom; and because, without this sense, his Lordship's words left us wholly in the dark how to judge of the truth of 'em, when he never told us, whether by the establish'd Church he meant all the Parish Churches in the Kingdom, or only those in the North of Ireland, nor gave us any Account what proportion the number of the one, or the other, bore to the number of the Meetings, without which Particulars none could judge whether his Assertion were true or false; or if true, whether any matter of reproach, or no? For perhaps in the whole Kingdom the number of Meetings is not much more to that of Parish-Churches, than that of 1 to 52. But,

B

2. If

2. If we allow his Lordship the sense that he now puts on his Assertion, yet his Computation will appear much too *Liberal* on his *own* side, and much more too *scanty* on the *Dissenters*.

His Computation is too *liberal* on his own side. For,

1. He takes a day, *viz.* the first of *April* in his Computation, on which there were several *Psalms* extraordinary us'd. For take the *Psalms* one with another, about five is the proportion of what is ordinarily us'd every Lord's-day, and 'twas only casual that eleven were then us'd, the eight first *Psalms*, as well as the three other, being short, and not above the proportion of four ordinary Chapters of five and twenty Verses long.

2. He brings in eleven *Psalms* as Chapters Read for Instruction, (about which alone the present Dispute lies) whereas he himself supposes 'em to be us'd as *Forms of Thanksgiving*; and so does the *Common-Prayer-Book*, in which these are not propos'd to be read as *Lessons*, but sung or said between the Minister and People. So that by a just Computation there remains only the five Chapters a day.

And his Computation is as much too *scanty* on the *Dissenters* side: For tho' I have drawn such a Computation as he mentions, yet I have drawn it only as a Computation of what is read in an entire Portion; and indeed have drawn it much below the Truth: for there is more usually a whole Chapter read, and in the Meetings of his Diocese none but one, make any Exception of the Winter Quarter. But I was so far from designing this, as a Computation of all that is read, that

I have, in the very words following Remark. p. 93. those he quotes, told him, 'That I look on his Charge to be so unjust, that if

' we take the Scriptures to be read whenever they are
' *verbatim* recited to the People, and so compute all the
' parallel Passages of Scripture that occur in their Expositions and Sermons, (in which both the N. C. Ministers in general, and particularly those in the North, use
' not to be sparing in their *Concordances*.) I see little reason to doubt, but there is as much of Scripture read, or

‘ as much of the inspir’d Word of God propos’d for the
 ‘ Instruction of the People in each Meeting , as in each
 ‘ Parish-Church. And this way of reading the Scripture
 ‘ I have shewn to be most agreeable to the Pattern and
 ‘ Practice of the Apostles, and of the Christian Church
 ‘ in their time.

Why then would the Bishop take no notice of this, which would have brought this Debate to a more fair and easie trial. For what is read this way among us, will amount to vastly more than what is read in an entire Portion. For take one Lord’s-day with another, we may by a reasonable Computation allow, between the Portion read, and the parallel Texts in the Exposition, a Chapter and a half. And if we compute two Chapters more to each Sermon, there will be every Lord’s-day five Chapters and a half read; and I do not here mention what Passages of Scripture occur in Catechizing, tho’ those will amount to a very considerable Portion, if put together. And for the *Psalms*, he has no more reason to bring them into the Computation, than I have to bring in all the Scriptural Expressions that occur in our *Praises* and *Prayers*, which I have also shewn him are more agreeable to the *directions* of the *New Testament*.

But to examine the Bishop’s present Computation, if we allow him his eleven *Psalms* that are us’d as Forms of Thanksgiving, I hope he will allow us all that’s strictly read for *Instruction*. And that he may not scruple my Computation, I’ll only allow one Chapter between the Portion read and the Exposition of it; I’ll only compute two Chapters more for the two Sermons preach’d every Lord’s-day; and upon this Computation (which is really much less than is read) it will appear, That in nine Meetings, allowing a Chapter for the Lecture, there is read in the three quarters of the year 351; and allowing two Chapters each Lord’s-day in the year for their Sermons, there is read 936 Chapters in a year: both these join’d make up 1287. Whereas in 42 Parish-Churches the Bishop computes (with the 11 *Psalms* and all) only 672 Chapters; and if we should add 42 Chapters more for their Sermon, (for few preach more

than once a day) this will make 714, which is a little more than half of what is read in those nine Meetings by the former Computation. But if this Computation were drawn to the utmost of Truth on the Dissenters side, (for since eight Meetings in his Diocese Lecture throughout the whole year, there are 104 Chapters to be added to the account, and as the Bishop reckons the *Psalms*, we should add all the Scriptural Passages that occur in our Thanksgivings) the Bishop's account would still appear the more wide from Truth. However, upon the lowest Computation he is really mistaken in this Matter of Fact, as he is apparently so in the foregoing, and has wrong'd 'em in the *Circumstance* as well as *Substance* of his Charge.

The third Matter of Fact which the Bishop undertakes to vindicate, is his Assertion, *That a Man may frequent the Meetings of the Dissenters all his life, and yet have no security, or hardly possibility, of learning from their publick Teachings all the great Mysteries of his Religion.*
 Disc. p. 82.

This I have indeed censur'd as a gross and shameless Accusation, and therefore was the more oblig'd to prove it so. To that purpose I not only told him, 'That the peculiar Mysteries of the Christian Religion were the ordinary subject of their Sermons, but that once a year at least they constantly went through all the necessary Articles of the Christian Religion in their Publick Catechizing, in which the Dissenting Ministers in the North were so particular, as to Examine every particular Person of whose knowledge there could be any occasion to doubt. And sure one would think if this be true, there can be no Modesty in such a malicious Accusation, Let's then hear what the Bishop has offer'd to Vindicate himself.

1. 'He proposes a Summary of the Principles of our Christian Religion, drawn rather from the Kalendar than from the Apostles Creed, of which several Articles are omitted, because his Lordship could find no Holy-days for 'em,

2. 'He

2. 'He tells us their Ministers have a certain time appointed every year for Teaching each of these Mysteries.

3. 'That there lies no Obligation on the Dissenting Ministers to go thro' these Mysteries in any such time, nor in their whole lives.

4. 'That he could not find upon Examination that their Ministers had done it.

5. 'He pretends that I endeavour to *See Adm. p.* excuse this, by putting him to produce 145, 146, 147. 'Scriptural Command relating to it.

Now I would desire him to review this, and tell us whether it signifie any thing to take off the plain Evidence I have produc'd, of the injustice of his Accusation, *viz. That their people are in publick Teachings yearly Catechiz'd, in which Exercise all the Mysteries of the Christian Religion, and particularly those mention'd by his Lordship, are explain'd to 'em. So that 'tis impossible they should attend their Meetings one year, but they'l have the opportunity of learning 'em.* Is it not strange that the Bishop should overlook so clear a Demonstration against the Truth of his Charge, under this Head, to which it properly does belong? For if this be true, there needs nothing more to prove what he has said to be so gross a Calumny as I have represented it. His Lordship has indeed thought fit to take notice of this in another place, *viz. p. 149.* where he dare not downright deny it, but would gladly insinuate a strong suspicion against the Truth of it. His words are these: *I leave this Matter of Fact with you, and know what you must conclude, and hope you will be so just to your selves, as to determine of what credit this Author ought to be in his Relations. I will not derogate from your Ministers labours in Catechizing their people; but notwithstanding their pains, there are some thousands of Men and Women in this Diocese that profess themselves of your Communion that were never Catechiz'd by 'em, &c.* Now either he means there are so many Persons that were never Catechiz'd in those places where Ministers are settled, or in those where there are none. If he mean the latter, What's this to the purpose

if it were true, as I do not find the Dissenting Ministers in his Diocese think it credible; if he mean the former, they do declare, 'They know of none that were never Catechiz'd where there are Ministers settled; but all are ordinarily examin'd once in the year, if not oftner. So that if any such remain ignorant, 'tis not for want of their pains to instruct 'em. And since he leaves this Matter of Fact with 'em, to be determin'd upon their serious consideration, he may easily see how contrary their Judgment of it is to his; and if he would yield to their Testimony concerning their own Practice, I hope he'll be convinc'd there is some Credit due to my Relations, but none to his rash and mistaken Accusations.

But besides that the necessary Principles of Religion are yearly explain'd in the *Catechism*, I have told him concerning the *Dissenters* in general, that tho' they have no other *Rule* to direct 'em herein than that of the Holy Scriptures, yet they do in their Sermons most frequently insist on the particular Mysteries of the Christian Religion, and can appeal to their People as witnesses thereof. And that this is true concerning the Dis-

senting Ministers in his Diocese, he may find Mr. *Craghead's* Account in these words, relating to the fore-mentioned

P. 75, 76.

Charge. 'I declare upon certain knowledge, that what he has asserted is a most unjust Imputation, for which he has reason to ask forgiveness of God; and I do appeal to many Thousands now living, who are ordinarily witnesses to the contrary; and many of the Author's Perswasion know the contrary. With what Peace of Conscience can any Man thus impose on Strangers, and impress future Generations with that which is so far from Truth! it being publickly known that we ordinarily and orderly go thro' all the Heads of our Christian Faith in our Publick Sermons. And what if this be not particularly prescrib'd by the Directory? will it follow that 'tis not done? Or is not the Scripture a sufficient Directory for that purpose? And whereas the Bishop insinuates this suspicious Argument of our neglect,

'That

‘ That he has seen many Sermons printed by our Party,
 ‘ and yet does not remember above two or three on these
 ‘ most necessary Subjects, (*viz.* the great Mysteries of our
 ‘ Religion). Is it not hence evident that he speaks at ran-
 dom of matters that he has little or no knowledge of? For
 I doubt not that instead of two or three, there are above
 two or three hundred Sermons publish’d by N.C. Ministers
 on the principal Mysteries of the Christian Religion;
 (including those that he has mention’d). What does he
 think of the first Collection of Sermons in the *Morning*
Exercise on the principal Heads of Christian Doctrine?
 Nay, some Divines have printed a large Body of Ser-
 mons on the particular Heads of the Assemblies Cate-
 chism; 176 of Mr. *Watson’s* are now extant. How many
 of those Mysteries are fully treated of in the large Vo-
 lumes of Dr. *Mantons* and Mr. *Charnock’s* Sermons? Not
 to mention Mr. *Baxter’s*, Mr. *Ant. Burgess’s*, Dr. *Bates’s*,
 and many more. So that if the Bishop have met with
 no more than two or three, ’tis only because he was ne-
 ver conversant in their Writings. But why then should
 he throw about such severe Reproaches in the dark, and
 censure with such assurance what he is so entire a stran-
 ger to, and what any, that ever was in the least acquaint-
 ed with their Writers, can shew him his ignorance and
 indiscretion in? And if the Conformists have printed
 more, ’tis no wonder, when the Press has been more o-
 pen to them, and they have had greater advantages for
 appearing in Publick.

And is it not strange the Bp. should pretend that I alledge
 what he quotes (p. 146, 147.) as an excuse in this matter,
 when I expressly disclaim the alledging of it for that end,
 because we need no excuse, and only produce it as an ar-
 gument *ad hominem*, which he was concerned to answer on
 the Principles he had laid down? So that upon the whole,
 the Bp. is oblig’d in all reason to do us right in this point,
 by owning so unhappy a Mistake, and wiping off an As-
 perision, which as ’tis manifestly untrue, so ’tis highly in-
 jurious to the Reputation of his Brethren; since if it
 were believ’d, no Man that has any concern for his
 own Soul, would trust it to their Pastoral conduct,

who are so grossly negligent of so necessary a Duty.

The next Matter of Fact is, the Bishop had affirm'd
That not One in Ten of the Dissenters
 Disc. p. 83. *Children get their Catechism by heart, nor*
One in Five hundred retain it.

On the contrary I suggested, *That I believ'd upon a*
more accurate trial, he would find that
 Rem. p. 87. *as many of the Dissenters Children have*
got it by heart, as of others that have done
so by the Church Catechism.

To clear himself, the Bishop here alledges, 'That he
 'has, besides grown People, Confirm'd near a thousand
 'Children, all above 13 years old, who could say the
 'Church Catechism. And on the other hand, he tells us
 'of many trials he made in whole Schools at a time, &c.
 'among the Dissenters, and found that
 Adm. p. 47, 48. 'the generality could not go above a
 'leaf or two in it; and he doubts whe-
 'ther any at all after twenty retain it.

Now in Answer hereto, the Dissenting Ministers in
 his Diocese declare, *That there are several Thousands of*
their People, both old and young, that can repeat the whole
Catechism. And how many there are in other Parishes
may be in part computed from that of Temple-more, in
which there are 600, or more, can repeat it. So that if
 his Lordship had so ill success in his trial, 'tis to be im-
 puted either to the sullenness or the baseness of those
 he examined: For certainly their own Ministers should
 know this matter better than he; and since he appeals
 to them, they declare *That they are assur'd he is mistaken*
in it.

I come then to the fifth and principal Matter of Fact
 disputed, viz. Concerning the frequency of Celebrating the
 Lord's Supper.

As to this the Bishop had appeal'd to the Dissenters in
 general without any distinction, *Whether it were not a*
great thing among many of 'em, if once in a year or two
a Communion be Celebrated in one of their Meetings; that
among some, 'tis often omitted for several years together,
and in some places for ten or more: and on this account se-
 verely

verely upbraids 'em with rare or no Communion as their peculiar practice. Disc. p. 161, 162.

In opposition to this Charge, I had told him, That for those Meetings in England and the South of Ireland, where Pastors are settled, the most of 'em constantly Celebrate the Lord's-Supper once a Month, others once in six Weeks or two Months, and a few every Lord's-Day, &c. From whence I infer'd the injustice of this Accusation, since the generality of the Dissenting Ministers celebrate this Ordinance much more frequently than the generality of the Parish Ministers; and their Communion is ordinarily more numerous, as well as more frequent, than those in the Parish-Churches, allowing for the proportion which the Number of the Dissenters bears to that of the Conformable Laity.

And now let us consider what the Bp. replies to this.

First he says, *He is not much concern'd in it, having address'd himself to those of his own Diocese.* Adm. p. 155. Answer, Can his Lordship with any reason pretend that he has asserted this only concerning the Dissenters of his own Diocese, when he does not only in the very entrance of his Book, propose to examine the several parts of Worship, as they are practis'd by those that differ from the established Church, or (as in the same page) by Protestant Dissenters---See Disc. p. 8. —But gives this very Chapter the Title of, *The practice of Dissenters about frequency of Communicating.* But of this I have said enough already to shew him the unreasonableness of this Excuse.

Secondly, He insinuates these Arguments against the probability of it: 'If this be true, (saith he) their practice is much alter'd from what it was formerly: 'For when the Churches were in their hands, it was quite otherwise. St. Warburgh's was a considerable Parish in the heart of Dublin, but had not the Lord's-Supper administred in it for Twelve Years; and I have heard the like of some other Churches in Dublin at that time. I find the same observed concerning the whole University of Oxford, from the Year 1648

' 1648 to 1660. *Antiq. Oxon.* And he adds, that he was told, ' That the *Dissenters* in *Waterford* did not ' Communicate above once a year before the Troubles, ' if so often. *Admon.* p. 155.

Ans. For what was practis'd either in *Dublin* or *Oxford* in *Oliver's* time, I neither know, nor am concerned with. But for this Assertion of mine concerning the present practice of those Meetings of *Dissenters* in *England*, and the *South* of *Ireland*, in which Pastors are settled, I need no *Vouchers* at all. 'Tis a Matter of Fact as easily known as our Publick Assemblies are, and what we can produce as many *Vouchers* for as we have ordinary Hearers, there being always publick notice given of our *Communions*. And if the Bishop dispute this Matter of Fact, he may next dispute, whether our Senses may be trusted in what we daily see and hear. For what he alledges concerning the practice of *Dissenters* in *Waterford*, of which he saith he had opportunity to enquire, it

See his Letter
in the end.

will appear by the account given me by Mr. *Sinclare*, who was at that time their Minister, that either his Enquiry was very slight, or his Informers very ignorant of the Matter; and that he has been as unhappily impos'd on by 'em, as I shall now shew him he has been by those on whose credit he has related what is practis'd in his whole Diocese.

'Tis evident then he has wrong'd the main Body of the *Dissenters* in this Charge of their rare or no *Communion*.

But there are some things relating to the practice of the *Dissenters* in the *North* of *Ireland* which I have asserted, and which the Bishop does very positively conclude me mistaken in.

I had told him from their Information, ' 'Tis so far ' from being true, that 'tis rare if once in a year or two ' a *Communion* be celebrated in their Meetings; that ' 'tis universally usual in every Meeting where an Ordain'd Minister is settled, to have the Lords-Supper ' administred constantly once a year, and twice in the ' larger Towns. That when the Sacrament is ad-
'ministred

‘ministred in one Meeting, ’tis usual for most of the
 ‘Members of neighbouring Parishes to frequent it.
 ‘That the most serious People among them Communi-
 ‘cate four or five times a year ; and have the opportu-
 ‘nity of doing so 10, 12, or 15 times, if they will take
 ‘the advantage of Receiving it in Neighbouring Con-
 ‘gregations, &c. And what I have here affirmed is
 the very account sent me from the Reverend Mr. *Adair*
 of *Antrim*, with the approbation of that Meeting : and
 I shall here subjoin this following Observation he makes
 in his own words ; ‘You know also, That where the
 ‘Sacrament is Administred, two parts of the Receivers
 ‘are usually strangers ; by which it is evident, that
 ‘once Administring according to the custom usual a-
 ‘mong Christians here, where they Communicate with
 ‘each other in their several Congregations respectively,
 ‘is equivalent to the Administring of it three or four
 ‘times a year to each particular Congregation, where
 ‘this way is not in use.

Now as to this, the Bishop tells us, ‘He has as good
 ‘opportunity of informing himself in these matters, as
 ‘any can have, and has been as diligent in his Enqui-
 ‘ries, in his Progresses through his several Parishes, and
 ‘on all occasions as he could ; and he has the following
 ‘Account returned him from many hands, and is satisfi-
 ‘fied there can be no great mistake in it.

“ In these last seven years the Lord’s Supper has been
 “ Celebrated among you, in *Derry* twice, in *Clander-*
 “ *mot* once, in *Ballindret* once, at *Ballikelly* once, at *Burt*
 “ twice, at *Ardstra* once, at *Abadowy* once, in all nine
 “ times, (*Admon. p. 151, 152.*) And *p. 153.* he adds a
 significant reason why he could not easily mistake in
 these matters, *viz.* ‘Because their Sacraments are Ad-
 ‘ministred with such a concourse of Spectators and
 ‘Hearers, that they can hardly escape Observation. (Tho
 by the way, why the Bishop should suppose this an Abuse
 brought in by Popery, I do not understand ; for I take
 it to be a very proper means of exciting in the *Specta-*
tors Pious desires of becoming Communicants : And for
 the Practice of the Primitive Church in dismissing all
 that

that were not Communicants when they entered on the Celebration of this Ordinance: I know of no other occasion for it, than their care to conceal these Mysteries of their Religion from the Pagans; a reason that we are not concerned in.)

But now, If after all this diligent Enquiry, the Bishop's Informers have grossly impos'd on him in almost every particular of this Account: Nay, if the Account where it is true signify nothing to the purpose for which 'tis alledged, and appear highly disingenious, then I hope he will think himself under some Obligation to distrust those *Informers* for the future, and will be more cautious of asserting any thing on their Credit, to the Reproach of his Brethren.

And here I would premise, That there is an instance of Disingenuity in the Bishop's Method of comparing the Practise of the *Dissenters* with that of the *Established Church*, too obvious and palpable to be over-look'd. In his accounts how oft the Sacrament has been Administred in the *Establish'd Church*, he goes no farther back then the time of his own Advancement to the See of *Derry*, which was soon after the Troubles; but in his Accounts how oft it has been Administred by the *Dissenters*, he takes in Seven years, tho he knows well enough that for two of the seven at least, both the Ministers and People were scattered, and had no opportunity for Celebrating that Institution; and yet he is so imprudent as to make this a great aggravation of their neglect; *That some of those seven years being times of afflictions, required a more frequent Celebration of this comfortable Sacrament then ordinary*; (See his *Errata* that refers to p. 27. l. 2.) as if he were ignorant, that some of their Ministers were fled to *Scotland*, others shut up in the Walls of *Derry*, and their People so dispers'd, that they could not for any considerable time after the Raising that Siege make up any distinct Congregations again. And if the Bishop alledge, that at least the *Dissenters* in *Derry* during the Siege should have had it Administred, I would desire him if he blame them on this Account, yet to be so impartial as to give the *Con-*
formists

formists there a share in his Reproof; for those I have desired to enquire upon the place, cou'd not learn that they Administred it any more than the other: So that those 2 years of publick Troubles and Confusion, ought in all reason to be shut out of his Account. And how unfortunate he has been in his particular and exact Account he now pretends to give, will appear by the following one that the Dissenting Ministers of his Diocels have after a very particular enquiry given of the year 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94.

'In the year 87, 88. The Sacrament was Administred in *Derry* twice, in *Donaghedee* twice, in *Drumrah* twice, in *Ardstra* twice, in *Urney* twice, in *Donaghmore* twice, in *Lifford* once, in *Glendermot* once, in all fourteen times.

'In the four last years since the troubles, the Sacrament was Administred,

'In *Derry* four times, in *Burt* thrice, in *Ahadowny* twice, in *Ardstra* twice, in *Ballindret* or *Lifford* once, in *Mahara* once, in *Ballikelly* once, in *Donaghmore* once, in *Serrabane* once, in all sixteen times. So that for the last Six years, in which there can be any pretence for requiring the Administration of the Sacrament from 'em, it has instead of nine times been Administred 30. Nay, Tho we reckon the two years of the Troubles in which they had no opportunity, yet the year 88 falling within the compass of the seven mentioned by the Bishop, they had it 22 or 23 times.

But I have a more just and severe Challenge against the *Sincerity* and *Candour* of this Account, which the Bishop's Informers have given him, *viz.* That they were not so honest as to acquaint him, that besides the two years of Troubles, in a great part of the other years, several of those Congregations had no Ministers at all, whom yet he makes accountable for the Sacrament during 7 years together; whereas that Ascertainment of mine which the Bishop here undertakes to disprove, concerns only such Congregations where Ministers are settled. (For it were ridiculous to expect Sacraments where there are no Ministers to Celebrate them.) Now besides the two years of seven that are to be taken off from each Congregation,

gregation, (for even *Derry* itself had no Ministers from the year 88 till after the Troubles) the following Congregations had no Ministers for the years hereafter mentioned.

'*Glendermot* or *Clondermot* had none at all since the Troubles, so that there has been a Minister there only one year of the seven, *Ardstra* had a Minister only two years since the Troubles, and in them two Sacraments, but had no Minister at all till after the Troubles. For *Ballindret* two Communion were appointed, but both prevented by their Ministers being visited with Sickness, and 'tis a year since he died, so that only one Sacrament could be Celebrated since the Troubles. For *Ballikelly*, their Minister besides long Sickness after the Siege of *Derry*, has been much in *Scotland* and elsewhere. For *Strabane* the Minister has not yet been two years there, and the true reason why the Sacrament was but seldom Administred there before, was (besides the Bodily Infirmities of their Minister) chiefly the violence of Persecution, which forced him out of that Parish. And yet such Blame the neglect, whose unchristian severity was the cause of it. For the other places which the Bishop has overlook't in his Account and I have added to mine, I must also add, *That Mahara had but one Sacrament since the Troubles, because they have had a Minister but one year; and the same must be said of Donoghmore. For Donaghedee, Drumra and Urny, which had constant yearly Communion before the Troubles, they have none of them had any Minister since.* Now by this Account it appears, that according to what was practised where Ministers have been settled, there would have been about 70 Communion Celebrated in the last seven years in the 10 Meetings now mentioned, if either the want of Ministers in places, or their Sickness, or the two years of Confusion and Troubles, or the like extraordinary Accidents had not prevented. So that for the Bishop not only to mistake nine times for about twenty three or thirty, but to charge these rare Communion on their Negligence in Administring this Ordinance, when they were wholly

wholly owing to these extraordinary occasions fore-mention'd, is so highly disingenuous and unjust, that he ought not to suffer those that have so unhappily abus'd him in these matters, to pass without a severe Reproof. For since the Dissenting Ministers in the North, on the account of the extraordinary pains they take to prepare their People for the Sacrament, celebrate it so seldom in each Congregation as once a year, there was the greater reason they should not be wrong'd in the Accounts given of their Practice. So that in this Matter of Fact, I hope the Bishop will own and retract his mistake.

For what I asserted concerning the *Sacraments being twice a year administred in the larger Towns in the North*, was intended, and is true of Belfast, Carrickfergus, and Antrim.

For what I have asserted concerning *their Members Communicating four or five times a year, is true of the most devout and serious of them; and so is it, That they may have the opportunity of Communicating ten, or twelve, or fifteen times a year, within some miles of their respective Habitations.*

This indeed the Bishop concludes to be a great mistake. 'Because on this Supposition he thinks it will clearly follow, that not much above a hundred distinct Persons have Communicated in the Diocese these last seven years. For four times 7 makes 28; and 3600 (which his Lordship computes to be the full number of their Communicants in seven years) divided by 28, gives about 128; but this can by no means be true: Therefore (saith the Bishop) he is certainly misinformed in this particular. *Admon. p. 153.*

Ans. The whole of this Computation depends on his two Suppositions, *That the Sacrament has been Administred but nine times in seven years, and that one with another, only 400 have received at one time, and so 3600 in all.* How great a mistake the former Supposition is, I have already shewn; and how much greater the latter is, will appear from this one Passage. That in the Parish of Templemore alone, (alias Derry) including the

two Meetings of *Derry* and *Burt*, there have Communicated since the Troubles above 5000, which is above 1400 more than he supposes to have Communicated in all the Diocese in seven years. Nay, whereas he supposes, 'That near as many have received in the Cathedral, 'in three years past, as have Communicated with the 'Dissenters in his whole Diocese in twice that time. It appears that near 2000 more of the Dissenters have Receiv'd in the same Parish, in about the same time, than have Receiv'd at the Cathedral, notwithstanding the Sacrament being Administred there every Month (tho' by the way, the Dissenters of *Derry* think he has stretch'd the number of his Monthly Communicants beyond all just bounds, of which they can give very shrew'd Evidence.) Since then his Computation of the number of Communicants among the Dissenters is so vastly wide from Truth, his Inference from it falls of course.

For what I asserted concerning their having the opportunity of Communicating ten, or twelve, or fifteen times a year, within some miles of their respective Habitations, the Bishop concludes it to be a mistake; 'Because there being but nine Meetings in his Diocese, 'tho' each Member should communicate at each Meeting, he could but communicate nine times a year, and 'must sometimes travel forty miles for a Sacrament. *Admon.* p. 154, 155.

Answ. I might here justly enquire, Why the Bishop should think the Dissenters of his Diocese so confin'd to it, that those that live near Meetings in another Diocese, may not take the opportunity of Communicating there. Does he think their *Communion* limited within the bounds of his *Jurisdiction*? But I must here acquaint him, That this Assertion of mine respects the generality of Meetings in the *North*; and therefore the truth of it is to be estimated from those parts where the main Body of the Dissenters are to be found. Now he cannot be ignorant that they are most numerous in the Counties of *Antrim* and *Down*. And therefore since he is pleased to arraign the Truth of the Assertion, I shall give

give him the following Demonstration of it, in reference to the Congregations that belong to the Meeting of *Antrim*, sent me by the Reverend M. W. Adair Minister of the Town of *Antrim*.

' I take *Carn-castle*, which is the most remote Congregation save one Northward in our Meeting, and within twelve miles they may Communicate at *Glenarm*, *Blade*, *Ballinanoich*, *Coyner*, *Ballyraiston*, *Ballyclare*, *Carmony*, *Dunagor*, *Lorn*, *I. Macgee*, *Broad-Island*, *Caricfergus* twice, *Temple-Patrick*, and *Carn-castle* itself. In all fifteen times.

' I take *Belfast*, which is the farthest of our Meeting Southward, and I suppose within twelve miles they may yearly Communicate above twenty times; viz. at *Belfast* twice, at *Caricfergus* twice, *Antrim* twice, *Holywood*, *Knock*, *Kirk-donold*, *Newton*, *Cumber*, *Killinchy*, *Donachadee*, *Tonochmeer*, *Danmurry*, *Lisbon*, *Annahilt*, *Bangor*, *Carmony*, *Temple-Patrick*, *Ballyclare*, *Ballyraiston*, *Dunnagor*, *upper Killade*, *lower Killade*, *Broad-Island*, (which is within 11 miles.) In all 26 times.

' You may easily conceive that many places, or almost all in our Meeting which are towards the Centre, can have the Sacrament as often at least, and generally oftener than at *Carn-castle*.

So that this Matter of Fact is true beyond all Exception, as I have asserted it, concerning the generality of their Meetings. And I am no way oblig'd to prove it, concerning every particular one in the remotest parts of the Province of *Ulster*.

Again, whereas the Bishop had affirm'd in his Discourse, ' That he could not compute that one in ten that go to their Meetings, ever Receive thro' the whole course of their Lives; and blames me for asserting the contrary, That there is not one in ten but do Communicate, except such as are withheld for want of competent knowledge, or on the account of Scandal, (or I might here add, thro' their own Scruples about their preparation for it,) as if this were a great Reflection upon 'em; as if 19 *Admon. p. 154.*

' in 20 were ignorant or scandalous. This will appear to be a very mistaken Account of this Matter, if we compare the number of *Hearers* in the two Meetings of *Derry* and *Burt*, with the number of *Communicants*. For their ordinary *Hearers* are about 2400. (Of which some part are suppos'd to be left at home every Lord's-day.) And yet in some of the Communion there since the Troubles, there have Communicated 984 Persons in one of those Meetings. So that we may compute about 1600 *Communicants* in both. Now tho' we allow a considerable deduction out of this number of *Communicants*, for the Strangers that may be suppos'd to have Receiv'd, yet the number of *Communicants* belonging to those two Congregations, compar'd with that part of their *Hearers* that are of Age to Receive, will sufficiently demonstrate that the Bishop's Computation, *That not one in ten Receive*, must be very wide from Truth.

For the generality of the *Dissenting Ministers* administering this Sacrament far oftner than the generality of the *Conforming Clergy*, I did not, as the *Admon.* p. 151. Bishop here groundlessly supposes, assert it concerning the *Dissenting Ministers* in the *North* of *Ireland*, but of those in *England* and the *South* of *Ireland*, (which make up the generality of 'em) concerning whom 'tis too apparently true to admit of being disputed.

And for their pressing their People as much or more to it, if we may judge thereof by the success of their Exhortations, I think it past doubt, that take an equal number of Meetings and *Parish-Churches*, and according to the proportion of Hearers in the one and the other, the *Communicants* are far more Numerous in the Meetings than the *Parish-Churches*, even tho' the former are far more strict in their Admissions; and in the latter few are ever refus'd that desire to come. Of which, if the Bishop please, I shall produce him manifold Instances. ' And for what ' his Lordship affirms of their Sermons tending rather ' to deter poor weak Creatures from Receiving, than ' encourage 'em, by magnifying the difficulty and danger

ger of the undertaking. I know no ground he has for this Assertion, unless it be, that they endeavour to deter all that are grossly ignorant or scandalous from profaning that Holy Institution; and dare not encourage any to approach to it, but such as in some measure understand the nature of it, and do not by a scandalous Life contradict those solemn Vows of Obedience which they there come to renew upon the memorials of a Crucified Saviour.

As for this last Matter of Fact, in reference to this Head about a *reputed Elder*, (or as in his *Errata* he corrects it) *Professor of thirty or forty years of Age that never Receiv'd, but disputes against it. Admon. p. 158.* If the Bishop had pleas'd to name him, the truth of what he asserts might have been examin'd. But till we know who he is, we must let this matter lie undecided, unless we dispute in the dark.

So that in the whole of this Debate which relates to the Sacrament, the mistake lies on the Bishop's side, even in reference to the *North of Ireland*; tho' he was oblig'd to make his Charge in his Discourse good concerning the *Dissenters in general*, without any such limitation.

For the Bishop's being offended at my saying, *That too many profligate sinners are admitted to the Communion in the Parish Churches, and his charging me on that account with being uncharitable and unjust, and challenging me to in-*

Admon. p. 156.

stance in some of his Diocese. I shall only reply, That I never yet met with any Person, before his Lordship, that doubted this Matter of Fact, and would not rather lament than dispute it. For 'tis no more than has been frequently own'd by the best of their own Writers, and imputed to the present corruption or weakness of their Discipline. And tho' for naming particular instances I must beg the Bishop's pardon, yet I will alledge what is equivalent to it. Does his Lordship think there are no profligate sinners in Military and Civil Employments in *England*? and yet the Sacrament-Test obliges 'em all to receive the Sacrament, and he knows they are not

scrupled when they come. Nay, were not the common Soldiers since the Restoration in *Dublin* forc't to receive, and driven to it by their Officers with Oaths and Curses, when nothing but the consciousness of their own wickedness deterr'd 'em? But as to this matter, I shall freely appeal to the common judgment of all sober Persons of his own Party, and fear not their Censure on this score; it being rather to be wish't, for the honour of the Reformed Religion, that the evidence of this Truth were less notorious. Nay, to the judgment of the same Persons I would refer it, what ground there is for that Observation which the Bishop tells us some have made, *That Enmity to the establish'd Religion and Immoralities are gotten on one side in too many instances, if it be meant of the Dissenters.* For besides that, the Dissenters have no Enmity at all to the establish'd Religion, having Subscrib'd in *England* all the *Doctrinal Articles* of it: That the Members of their Communion, compar'd with those of the establish'd Church, are more generally guilty of Immoralities, is an Observation that I suppose will hardly pass current with any but such as have a faith to believe whatever their Interest or their Affection to a Party dictates to 'em.

And since in reference to these Matters of Fact his Lordship requires me to produce my *Vouchers*, and charges me *as writing upon none, or very partial Information*, I shall so far comply with his Demand, as to produce the following Testimonial of the Truth of what I have said, in reference to the practice of the Dissenters in his Diocese, about whom our present Debate lies, from these three under-named Ministers in his Diocese, who have diligently examined these Matters of Fact, and whose Informations communicated to me, relating to 'em, were, together with these Papers, review'd and approv'd by the whole Presbytery.

WE the under-subscribers having perus'd these Papers of the Reverend Mr. Joseph Boyle, drawn up in Answer to that part of the Bishop of Derry's Admonition which concerns the practice of the Protestant Dissenters in this

the Diocese of Derry, do declare, Those Informations which we have given him relating to it, and to which he here refers, to be true ; and hereby attest 'em as such to the World, in order to our just Vindication from the misrepresentation made of those Matters of Fact by the Bishop of Derry.

Robert Craghead Minister of Derry.

Andr. Ferguson Minister of Burt.

Will. Homes Minister of Strabane.

And for his Lordship's farther satisfaction, Whereas one of the most remarkable differences between his account and theirs, relates to the frequency of Celebrating the Lord's-Supper (his account supposing them guilty of very scandalous negligence) the Reverend Mr. Craghead has now in his hands, and is ready to produce whenever his Lordship desires it, particular Testimonials of this Account now given under the Hands of the Elders, and other Communicants of each Meeting. Nay, since the difference is most remarkable in reference to Derry itself, which he affirms has had the Sacrament but twice these seven years, whereas they assert it has been administered five times, (tho' for two of the seven years they had no Minister of their own ;) and since the Bishop's Friends pretend to undeniable Evidence for the truth of this Matter of Fact, I shall (to shame, if possible, his Informers out of their Confidence) trouble the Reader with the following Certificate, as a Specimen of what shall be produced, if requir'd, from the other Congregations.

WE the under-named Subscribers, having heard and read of several things charged on the People of the Presbyterian persuasion of this City and Suburbs, now under the Pastoral charge and care of the Reverend Mr. Robert Craghead, and formerly of the Reverend Mr. Robert Rule, for the honouring the great God who is a God of Truth ; and in opposition to all those that have endeavour'd to possess the minds of such as are Strangers to us, by speaking or writing contrary to Truth ; We do hereby certify and give

under our Hands, and are ready to make it farther appear, if need be, upon Oath, that from the time of our being under the charge and care of Mr. Robert Rule, as our Pastor, which commenc'd about the Year 1672. till the time of his being necessarily call'd to go for Scotland, which was A. D. 1688. we had the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper duly Administred by him once a year in his Congregation; excepting those wherein we were violently hindered by the severity of Persecution. And more particularly that the Reverend Mr. Robert Rule Administred that solemn Ordinance of the Lord's Supper to us in this place, in May 1687, and in April 1688: soon after which we were desolate of any fixed Minister, till it pleas'd the Lord our now Reverend Pastor, Mr. Craghead, was fix'd among us in the year 1690; and he has since then Administred this Sacrament in this Congregation the 12th day of July 1691. On the 24th of July 1692. On the 14th day of May 1693. And on the 22d day of July 1694. The cause of our knowledge hereof is, that we were Members of this Congregation, and did then partake of that Ordinance. And we desire this may be compar'd with what is asserted in a Book, Entitled, An Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocese of Derry, &c. p. 153. In Testimony of the Truth whereof we have hereunto set our Hands at London-Derry the 25th of September, 1694.

Henry Long, Mayor.

Alexander Lekey, Mayor Elect.

James Wilson. James Lenox. Alexander Gourdon.
 Hugh Davey. Horas Kennedy. John Cowan.
 Hugh Eadie. Robert Harvey. Will. Mackie.
 Edward Brooks. Andrew Garven. John Harvey.

And

And sure if the Bishop's Enquiries be so strangely unsuccessful in the very place where he resides, we may justly infer how little regard is due to those he made in other places. And upon the whole the unbiaſt Reader may judge, what ground his Lordſhip had to ſay, in reference to all theſe Matters of Fact, That concerning the Truth of what he had ſaid, *he need do no more than appeal to the Conſciences of Diſſenters.* And that he muſt tell 'em, that what he wrote was from Sight, Experience, or certain Information; whereas he ſaith I had my Accounts of things only at ſecond hand, and produce no Vouchers. *Admon. p. 142.* If he will ſtand to their Judgment to whoſe Conſciences he has appeal'd, he may eaſily foreſee his doom; for their Sight and Experience are quite contrary to his. And ſince he obliges me to produce Vouchers for what I have ſaid, I hope hee'll either yield this Point, or produce as credible ones as theſe.

But before I diſmiſs this Head, it will be requiſite to take ſome notice of thoſe remarkable words wherewith the Biſhop cloſes it, *To conclude, (ſaith he) it were as eaſie to ſhow, That Mr. B. is miſtaken in every Matter of Fact, wherein he has charg'd me with falſhood, as in theſe; but the deſign'd ſhortneſs of this Admiſſion will not give me leave to purſue 'em.*

Anſw. I hope the Biſhop will at length be convinc'd, That inſtead of vindicating his former Miſtakes, he has only run into new ones, which are ſomewhat the leſs excuſable, becauſe he had ſo much time and leiſure, as well as advice to correct 'em. And ſince moſt of them are very injurious to the good Name of his Brethren, common Juſtice ſhould have oblig'd him, inſtead of Reprinting, to have Retracted 'em. But as he has had ſo little ſucceſs in his endeavours to clear himſelf in the foregoing Particulars, ſo I ſomething wonder that he ſhould, with all this aſſurance, pretend that I have in all the other Inſtances groundleſſly charg'd him with falſhood or miſtakes. What! will his Lordſhip ſtill go about to perſwade us, *That we have no other way of praiſing God, but by ſinging* *Disc. p. 24.*

a verse or two of a Psalm ? Or that the first Principle he ascribes to us about Prayer, is asserted in the *Directory*, when he himself tacitly corrects the mistake in this *Second Edition* of his *Discourse* ? Or that he has truly represented the Judgment and Sense of the *General Assembly* in Scotland in their *Directions concerning Family Worship* ? p. 44, 45. Will he still persuade us, That a considerable Body of Dissenters teach all Forms of Prayer to be unlawful, and affirm it sinful to joyn where any are w'd ? p. 57. Or, that on the account of this Principle, the pious custom of Training up young People to a constant course of Devotion in their Morning and Evening secret Prayer, is too universally laid aside among the Dissenters ; concerning the truth whereof, he confidently appeals to all of 'em ? p. 64. Will he still affirm, That the *Directory* excludes all Bodily Worship ? p. 128. Or, That the Dissenters in general do not stand up at their Thanksgivings, and generally sit at their Publick Prayers ? p. 129. And that they have not one visible Act of Adoration in their Assemblies, except the Mens uncovering their Heads in Prayer ? p. 130. Nay, will he still persist in it, That the Dissenters are taught that External Postures of Bodily Worship may in no case be practis'd ? p. 137. That the *Directory* does not allow the People to signify their Consent by saying Amen to their Publick Thanksgivings ? p. 138. That as to Gestures, such as Kneeling, Standing, Bowing the Head, the Dissenters condemn 'em all as Relicks of Idolatry and Superstition ? That by turning all Bodily Worship out of their Assemblies, they are meer Spectators, not Joynt-worshippers ? p. 138, 139. Or, That neglecting to kneel at the Sacrament has hardened them against all Reverence in other parts of Worship ? p. 144. And to add no more, Will he still justify all as true concerning the Dissenters in general, which he has affirmed of 'em, without any distinction in reference to the Lord's Supper ? p. 161, 162. Will the Bishop still think to persuade us that in all these Matters of Fact he has justly accus'd us, and we have no reason to complain of being Misrepresented and Abus'd ? Does he think his bare word sufficient to bear down the Reputation of so considerable a

Body

Body of Protestants? Or would he have us silently bear the odium of so many grievous Reflections cast upon us, which we are sure of the *injustice* of, as we are that we know our own *Opinions* or *Practices*. His Lordship must therefore give us leave to be free with him on this occasion, and to demand once more, That he either *make good* his Charge against us in these Particulars, or honestly confess his being *mistaken* or *misinform'd* about 'em. Which if he would once do, he will find us very ready, not only to forgive the wrong done us, but to entertain more favourable thoughts of his veracity and charity, than 'tis almost possible for us to do, while these *mistakes* in his *Book*, and in his *Admonition*, stand *unretracted*.

There are but Two things more which I think my self oblig'd to take notice of, before I come to consider the Exceptions he produces against some particular passages in the *Remarks*.

The first is, That the Bishop tells me, 'I have nothing to do with him, and the Dissenters of his Diocese; and blames me for interposing my self without any Call or Reason, as well as Writing upon little or no Information. *Admon. p. 158.*

To which I shall only offer a few Things in my own defence.

1. I have already had occasion to shew, That the Bishop's *Discourse* was in all just construction levell'd against the Dissenters in general. Nay, he usually falls upon the *Directory*. which is a Book the generality of Dissenters have a great and just value for, (the Compilers of it having us'd great modesty and tenderness in its Composure, without following the imposing temper of those that requir'd so peremptory a Declaration of Assent and Consent to all things contain'd in and prescrib'd by the Book of Common Prayer, and the Form of Ordaining Bishops, Priests and Deacons.) So that since his *Discourse* is directed against what himself supposes to be the common Opinions and Practices of Dissenters, every Man among 'em had a just right to defend the Common Cause, and the Bishop has no just ground

ground to complain of any ones interposing in it.
Nay,

2. I had a very just Call to it; and that from the Dissenting Ministers of his own Diocese; who urg'd this Reason for it: That as the Bishop's *Discourse* might possess those that were strangers to the Dissenters, with ill apprehensions of 'em, if his Mistakes were not discover'd; so few would read an Answer to it, if it came not out while the Matter was fresh in their minds; and they had less of leisure for such an undertaking at that time. And as I did not interpose without their desire, so neither did I write without particular Informations from 'em, to which I have exactly adher'd, and from which I have yet seen no reason to recede.

3. I had yet a more particular concern in the Bishop's Book; for tho' he would not vouchsafe an Answer to some former Papers of mine (shewing the unreasonableness of his excluding us from the Catholick Church) yet he took the liberty to misrepresent the *Principles* laid down in 'em, and charg'd em as *inconsistent with the Unity and Peace of the Church*. So that I lay under a particular obligation to vindicate my *Self*, as well as under a common one to justify the common Opinions and Practices of Dissenters, which the Bishop had either misrepresented or argued against upon weak and insufficient grounds.

The second the Bishop complains of, is, *That I give him hard words, and speak hard things of him*. Admon. p. 141, 142, 145, &c.

Answer. I may, I think, in this Matter appeal to any equal Judges of things, Whether the Dissenters have not juster reason to complain of him, for saying so many *hard and reproachful things* of them without any just ground, than he to complain of me, only for telling him how greatly he has wrong'd us, and how little regard he has had to Truth in such a multitude of Particulars wherein he has unreasonably accused us. And indeed some of those Accusations tended so apparently to defame and render us odious, that it would have look'd like a tacit confession of Guilt, to have expres'd no distast

distast at such disingenuous Treatment. Nor do I understand that the Bishop had any great reason to expect the same deference to be paid to him, that would have been due to any other of his character, that had given any evidence of his Moderation and Charity. 'Tis true indeed, both his *Discourse* and *Admonition* (bating the many severe, but groundless Aspersions in 'em) have an air of mildness and temper in the style of 'em, and we often meet with friendly Appellations in 'em. But I take mens declared *Opinions*, and especially their *Actions*, to be a surer Indication of their Temper than the common Civilities that occur in their way of writing. *Joab* had very obliging Language towards *Amasa* in his mouth, *Art thou in health my Brother?* but he carried a sharp Tool in his hand, and he had no friendly design. We can lay little stress on any seeming expressions of a man's charity, who will not recall that virtual Sentence of *Damnation* he has publicly past upon us, by denying us to be a part of the *Catholick Church*. We like not the gentle language of *Writs de Excom. Cap.* And we can perceive no extraordinary mildness and friendship in such *Covenants* inserted in *Leases*, as the following one: [¶ And the said A. B. his Executors, &c. does by these Presents covenant to and with the said *William* Lord Bishop of *Derry* and his Successors, &c. for the time being, that neither he the said A. B. his Executors, &c. nor any of 'em, &c. shall or will Set, Let, or Demise the Premises, or any part thereof, to any Male or Popish Priest, &c. or to any Minister or Teacher dissenting from the Church of *Ireland*. Neither shall wittingly or willingly suffer 'em to dwell or reside on any part, parcel or member thereof, but him or them shall endeavour to expel and keep from the same, so far as by the Laws of this Realm they shall be enabled.] So that if the Bishop have been reprov'd somewhat sharply for his *unfair Dealing* in this new Dispute, he has but furnish'd us with too just an Apology for it. And yet I know of no words given him so hard (how deserved soever) as those he has given the whole Body of Dissenters which have been wholly *undeserved*.

undeserved. And I am sure he will not find in the *Remarks* any such uncharitable Sentiments exprest concerning the *established Church*, as occur frequently in his *Discourse* concerning the *Dissenters*. And for what Touches himself only, he seems to have little reason of complaint, unless he can clear himself a little better in Matters of Fact than he has done in this *Admonition*.

I come now to consider the Bishops few *Exceptions* against the *Argumentative* part of the *Remarks*.

In his Entrance on which he alledges, *That 'tis the design of the Remarks to hinder the Dissenters from joyning with the established Church in their ordinary Lord's Day Worship.* Now I know no reason why his Lordship should pretend that to be my design, which I no where propos'd as such: For all I profess to attempt was, *the Vindication of our own worship from the weak charge of human Inventions, and the retorting his Arguments; where they were stronger against the Worship of the established Church than against ours.* But if the Bishop here speak of occasional Communion with the established Church in her ordinary Lord's-Days Worship, 'tis strange that he should suppose it my design to hinder the Dissenters from it, when I expressly declare my own opinion for the lawfulness of it; *Remarks p. 146.* and urg'd him to express the same Charity towards us, which I perceive he cannot be so easily perswaded to.

He farther premises, *That it was incumbent on one that answer'd his Book, to justify our way of Worship, by shewing that the manner of performing it, in the several parts of it, as distinguish'd from theirs, is warranted by Scripture Precept or President, or by direct consequence from thence, &c.* But (he saith) instead of undertaking this Task, Mr. B. argues against and condemns the Rule; whereas, as strict as it appears, he has justified all the particular ways of Worship in the *established Church* by it; and if I could have done the same for ours, I need not have declin'd it. *Admon. p. 159, 160.*

Ans.

Ans. If his Lordship had answer'd the *Remarks*, he would have had perhaps some pretence to have said this. But he has none now, when he himself is forc'd (as I shall shew) to alter his own Rule, when I had so largely prov'd that our Worship, in most particular parts of it, was more agreeable to Scripture-Precept or Example than theirs; and also shewn him that his Rule, as laid down by himself, would condemn all Churches in the World in which there were some circumstantial modes, and those very lawful, that neither express Scriptural Precept nor Pattern could be produc'd for, nor indeed could reasonably be expected. And therefore since the Bishop lays so great stress on this Matter, I shall carefully examine the Three Heads he suggests in reference to it.

1. He saith, *I give another Rule for the ordering God's Service.*

2. He saith, *I endeavour to persuade the Dissenters that the greatest Exception they have against joyning with the establish'd Church is not matter of Worship.*

3. He saith, *I alledge that he has omitted to handle that part of Worship against which the Dissenters have the greatest Exception, and that because he could not defend it.*

1. He saith, *I give another Rule for the ordering God's Service.* And to that purpose he thus pretends to cite my own Expressions. "As to his new Rule of Worship, you will find it in p. 7. in these words. Modes and Circumstances of Divine Worship, — tho' necessary in general by Divine Precept, yet are left in particular to be determin'd by Human Prudence. For tho' God has commanded Publick Prayer, &c. yet what time or place we shall assemble in, in what order these parts of Worship shall be perform'd, &c. are left to Human Determination, only therein the general Rules of Scripture must be regarded. From whence his Lordship concludes, That 'tis my Rule or Principle. That all Modes of Worship whatever are left to Human Prudence, and particularly the determination of Time, Place, Order, Circumstances, Postures, and U-
"tensils

"utensils in all Cases. *Against which he argues*, That
 "God has not only given us general Rules to praise
 "him, pray to him, hear his Word, &c. but he has
 "likewise given us many particular Rules and Exam-
 "ples concerning each of these, to which if we dili-
 "gently attend, and mind the consequences of 'em,
 "and apply 'em to the like cases, we may have suffici-
 "ent Directions from Scripture to order our Worship,
 "without having recourse to Human Prudence.

Answer. If the Bishop please to review the *Marks*, he
 will find that he has plainly mistaken and misrepresent-
 ed what they assert in reference to this matter, that he
 might have some pretence to find fault with it. For
 in the place he cites I am laying down no *Rule* at all,
 but only mentioning an improper sense of Human In-
 ventions, as the Reader would have evidently perceiv'd
 if the Bishop had not, by mis-citing my words, main'd
 'em, and perverted the plain sense of 'em: For they
 run thus in the *Remarks*, p. 7. 'It remains only that I
 ' subjoyn, in order to the clearing the state of this Con-
 ' troversie, That there is a very improper sense, in which
 ' this phrase of Human Inventions in the Worship of
 ' God may possibly be us'd, *viz.* To signify such Modes
 ' and Circumstances of Divine Worship, as tho' neces-
 ' sary in general by Divine Precept, yet are left in par-
 ' ticular to be determin'd by Human Prudence, &c. Of
 which kind of Circumstantial Modes, I there produce
 several Instances relating to Time, Place, Orders, U-
 tensils, &c. and would gladly know whether his Lord-
 ship can produce any particular Determination of 'em
 in Scripture for every particular *Church*; *viz.* What
 time of the Lord's-Day their Publick Worship shall be-
 gin, what Place they shall assemble in, what Translati-
 on of the Bible they shall use; whether they shall be-
 gin with Prayer or Praise, or what Vessels they shall
 use in the Celebration of the Sacraments. But I do by
 no means suppose, ' That God has given no particular
 ' Directions at all in reference to the Modes of Worship,
 ' but the quite contrary; for 'tis one Instance I produce of
 Human Inventions. p. 55. ' That whereas every part
 ' of

of Worship enjoy'd by God as Prayer, Praise, &c.
 is capable of being perform'd in various Circumstan-
 tial Modes, if the Law of God expressly enjoyn us a-
 ny particular Mode, than to devile another of our
 own, exclusive of that which he has chosen and de-
 termin'd, is to bring in a sinful Human Invention in-
 to his Worship. As I instance there in Prayers in an
 unknown Tongue, Communicating without the Cup,
 Solitary Communion, &c. Such Modes then as God
 has determin'd by the particular Directions of his Word,
 I plainly exclude from the Determination of Human
 Prudence. Nay, so far am I from supposing that Hu-
 man Prudence may Arbitrarily appoint any Modes of
 Worship that Men think fit, that I rank among sinful
 Inventions, p. 6. All such Rites and Ceremonies of
 Mens own devising, as are no way warranted by any
 general Rules of Scripture, and yet made stated Ap-
 pendages of any part of Divine Worship, and terms of
 Communion in it. All therefore that I assert is, That
 all those Circumstantial Modes of Worship, that are in
 general necessary by Divine Precept (because God's
 own Commands about his Worship cannot be executed
 without the determination of 'em) and yet are not in
 particular determin'd in Scripture, must be determin'd
 by Human Prudence; and that to call such Circum-
 stantial Modes, when determined agreeable to the ge-
 neral Rules of Scripture, *Human Inventions*, is a very im-
 proper sense of the word, and to make 'em *sinful*, is a
 Principle fit only for the wildest Sectaries, since it would
 condemn a great many prudential orders practis'd both
 by them and us, and indeed by all Churches in the
 World. And if the Bishop pretend to disprove this As-
 sertion, he must produce us particular Precept or Pat-
 tern from Scripture, for his beginning Publick Worship
 at nine or ten in the forenoon, rather than twelve, for
 his meeting at the Cathedral, rather then in ano-
 ther place; for his using the old Translation of the
 Psalms, and the new one of the rest of the Bi-
 ble; for his using at the Sacrament *Loaves rather than*
Cakes, and using one sort of Wine rather then another,
 and

and employing Pewter or Silver Vessels rather than Wooden or Golden ones. So that what I assert, is not only very innocent, and free from any such dangerous consequences as the Bishop suggests, but indeed too obvious and plain for any Man of sense to doubt of it; and his Lordship could never have begun any new Dispute about it, if he had not rais'd a mist by misunderstanding the sense of as clear Expressions as could well be us'd on this Subject. Since then he has so plainly mistaken in ascribing such a *Rule* to me as I no where laid down, but have so fully disclaim'd, all the consequences he draws from it, either to his own Advantage, or our Prejudice, fall of course, and I am no way concern'd in 'em as consequences drawn from any Opinion of mine: For 'tis plain, the Rules laid down in the *Remarks* do not justify all the Modes of Worship practis'd in the establish'd Church, neither that way of singing the *Prose Psalms* that excludes the generality of the People, nor the Cathedral Musick, nor the confining all Publick Prayers to stinted Forms, nor reading the *Apocripha*, nor bowing towards the East or Altar, or at the Name of Jesus, nor Reading one part of the Prayers where many of the People cannot hear 'em, nor the use of the Cross, or our sort of Sponsors in Baptism, nor so much as kneeling in the Act of Receiving. These and many more particular Modes are not defensible by any *Rule* I have laid down, tho' I have shewn him that our own Practices are. Nay, no *Rule* I have laid down will defend all sort of Holy-days, nor any Determinations relating to Habits, Place or Utensils that are contrary to Edification, or to Order and Decency.

But whereas the Bishop pretends, That those particular Rules and Directions he had produc'd from Scripture, relating to the *Adm.* p. 43, 44. several parts of Worship, 'The Letter of Scripture is clearly on his side, and I have not oppos'd Scripture to Scripture, but have declin'd the literal sense in many cases without reason, and have preferr'd the determinations of Human Prudence in others, as being more for Edification than the Scripture Examples,

* Examples, and particularly in the singing of *Psalms*. I must needs on this occasion acquaint him, that I think the quite contrary to what he Asserts, will appear to any that impartially compare the *Remarks* and his *Discourse* together, at least I hope his Lordship does not expect we should take his peremptory Assertion for a proof of it: but since he supposes this Observation to be manifest in reference to that particular Mode of Praising God by *singing of Psalms*, I should add, that I think it not so ingenuous in the Bishop to Assert this with such assurance, when I have in the *Remarks* taken such particular pains to shew, That our ways of singing *Psalms* is most conformable to the only Precept in Scripture, that relates to the use of 'em in our Praises, 5 Eph. 19. 3 Col. 16. to which he has yet vouchsaf'd no Answer. He has been told, 'That the Precept enjoyns vocal singing, which bare saying 'em no way Answers, p. 13, 14. 'That since the *Psalms* of *David* were wrote in such sort of Metre and Verse as was then us'd, and since the knowledge of their Musical Tunes and Instruments is quite lost, to suppose us oblig'd to an exact imitation of 'em, were to suppose us oblig'd to impossibilities. That therefore the Command which obliges Christian Churches to sing *Psalms*, necessarily obliges us to turn 'em into such sort of Metre and Verse, as will best accommodate 'em to be sung by the People. Whereas to put 'em into no other Metre than the pointed *Psalter* in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, is to exclude the generality of the People from any capacity of complying with God's own Command for singing 'em. And as the Tunes of those pointed *Psalms* are quite different from Hebrew ones, so they are as much a Human Invention as the Tunes of the Common Metre-Versions, and therefore do set up that pointed *Psalter* in the *Service-Book*, whose Tunes the Body of the People cannot follow to the Exclusion of those Metre-Versions according to which they can joy in singing *Psalms*. (as the Bishop seems to design) is in his language to set up an Human Invention to the violation of a Divine Command, by rendering the Peoples obser-

and employing *Peuter* or *Silver Vessels* rather than *Wooden* or *Golden* ones. So that what I assert, is not only very innocent, and free from any such dangerous consequences as the *Bishop* suggests, but indeed too obvious and plain for any *Man* of sense to doubt of it; and his *Lordship* could never have begun any new *Dispute* about it, if he had not rais'd a mist by misunderstanding the sense of as clear Expressions as could well be us'd on this Subject. Since then he has so plainly mistaken in ascribing such a *Rule* to me as I no where laid down, but have so fully disclaim'd, all the consequences he draws from it, either to his own Advantage, or our Prejudice, fall of course, and I am no way concern'd in 'em as consequences drawn from any Opinion of mine: For 'tis plain, the *Rules* laid down in the *Remarks* do not justify all the *Modes* of *Worship* practis'd in the establish'd Church, neither that way of singing the *Prose Psalms* that excludes the generality of the *People*, nor the *Cathedral Musick*, nor the confining all *Publick Prayers* to stinted *Forms*, nor reading the *Apocripa*, nor bowing towards the *East* or *Altar*, or at the *Name* of *Jesus*, nor *Reading* one part of the *Prayers* where many of the *People* cannot hear 'em, nor the use of the *Cross*, or our sort of *Sponsors* in *Baptism*, nor so much as kneeling in the *Act* of *Receiving*. These and many more particular *Modes* are not defensible by any *Rule* I have laid down, tho' I have shewn him that our own *Practices* are. Nay, no *Rule* I have laid down will defend all sort of *Holy-days*, nor any *Determinations* relating to *Habits*, *Place* or *Utenfils* that are contrary to *Edification*, or to *Order* and *Decency*.

But whereas the *Bishop* pretends, That those particular *Rules* and *Directions* he had produc'd from *Scripture*, relating to the *Adm.* p. 43, 44. several parts of *Worship*, 'The Letter

' of *Scripture* is clearly on his side, and I have not oppos'd *Scripture* to *Scripture*, but have declin'd the literal sense in many cases without reason, and have preferr'd the determinations of *Human Prudence* in others, as being more for *Edification* than the *Scripture* Examples,

* Examples, and particularly in the singing of *Psalms*. I must needs on this occasion acquaint him, that I think the quite contrary to what he Asserts, will appear to any that impartially compare the *Remarks* and his *Discourse* together, at least I hope his Lordship does not expect we should take his peremptory Assertion for a proof of it: but since he supposes this Observation to be manifest in reference to that particular Mode of Praising God by *singing of Psalms*, I should add, that I think it not so ingenious in the Bishop to Assert this with such assurance, when I have in the *Remarks* taken such particular pains to shew, That our ways of singing *Psalms* is most conformable to the only Precept in Scripture, that relates to the use of 'em in our Praises, 5 *Eph.* 19. 3 *Col.* 16. to which he has yet vouchsaf'd no Answer. He has been told, 'That the Precept enjoyns vocal singing, which bare saying 'em no way Answers, p. 13, 14. 'That since the *Psalms* of *David* were wrote in such sort of Metre and Verse as was then us'd, and since the knowledge of their Musical Tunes and Instruments is quite lost, to suppose us oblig'd to an exact imitation of 'em, were to suppose us oblig'd to impossibilities. That therefore the Command which obliges Christian Churches to *sing Psalms*, necessarily obliges us to turn 'em into such sort of Metre and Verse, as will best accommodate 'em to be sung by the People. Whereas to put 'em into no other Metre than the pointed *Psalter* in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, is to exclude the generality of the People from any capacity of complying with God's own Command for *singing* 'em. And as the *Tunes* of those pointed *Psalms* are quite different from *Hebrew* ones, so they are as much a *Human Invention* as the *Tunes* of the *Common Metre-Versions*, and therefore do set up that pointed *Psalter* in the *Service-Book*, whose Tunes the Body of the People cannot follow to the Exclusion of those *Metre-Versions* according to which they can join in singing *Psalms*. (as the Bishop seems to design) is in his language to set up an *Human Invention* to the violation of a *Divine Command*, by rendering the Peoples obser-

'vance of it impracticable, p. 189, 190. And should not his Lordship in all equity and reason have attempted a clear refutation of this Argument, before he had ventur'd to say, *That in this particular of singing Psalms, the Scripture is on his side, and that I prefer the determinations of Human Prudence before Scripture Examples*; when I have so plainly shewn him, That the *Example* or *Pattern* of Jewish singing is unimitable by us, because unknown to us, but that the *Precepts* of Scripture plainly obliges us to this way of singing, because 'tis most generally practicable among us. To what purpose is it to reason in these matters, if the Bishop think his bare *Affirmation* sufficient to weigh down all *Arguments*? And why does he call this *Admon.* p. 164. *Our manner of singing Psalms*, when 'tis *theirs* as well as *ours*; and tho' he has ventur'd to exclude it from being any substantial part of their Worship, and made it a meer Diversion, yet he has done it without any Authority or Commission from the establish'd Church, by whom it seems allow'd as a stated part of Worship.

And as the Bishop has ascrib'd to me a *Rule* about Worship that I never laid down, so he stiffly pretends to adhere to his *own*, when yet what I had alledg'd against it, as unhappily worded by himself, has so far convinc'd him, that he found himself necessitated to enlarge it. He had before said, *That all*

Disc. p. 3.

ways of Worship are displeasing to God that are not expressly contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, or warranted by Examples of Holy Men mention'd therein. He had us'd the phrase, *ways of Worship*, frequently to signify circumstantial *Modes* of it. I had told him, That if his words be taken in this strict sense, they contain such an Assertion, that if a man believ'd it, he would find it hard to joyn in any Assembly in the Christian World, and must renounce Communion with the Parish Churches. (For many circumstantial *Modes* of Worship are practis'd there, which are neither expressly contain'd in the Scriptures, nor warranted by any Examples of Holy Men that have us'd those particular circumstantial *Modes*, ex. gr. The singing

Psalm

the D

Psalms as appointed in the Common-Prayer-Book, or
 in the Metre compos'd by Sternbold and Hopkins, the
 use of a stinted Liturgy in general, and particularly our
 English one, Reading the Apocrypha, bowing at the
 Name of Jesus, kneeling at the Sacrament, &c.) But
 his Lordship, instead of taking any notice of this ob-
 jection against his Rule, very silently now
 extends it, only to make those things *Admon. p. 165.*
unlawful that are not contain'd in Scrip-
ture, or warranted by Example of Holy Men in it, or may
not be deduc'd by clear consequence, or parity of Reason
from them. Now 'tis evident that many things may be
 drawn by clear consequence and parity of reason from the
 Precepts of Scripture that are not expressly contain'd in
 'em. And the same may be said of Scripture Examples.
 So that the Bishop has now really charg'd his Rule by
 this new comprehensive Addition to it, and as 'tis now
 laid down, 'tis much the same with what I have assert-
 ed, tho' I think not so clear. And now he will find,
 there's nothing in our Worship but what is easily justi-
 fiable by his own Rule in this just latitude: For our
 manner of singing it self, (which is the Instance he so
 often insists on) may be drawn by just consequence and
 by parity of reason, both from the Precepts and Exam-
 ples of singing in the Holy Scriptures. For if we must
 sing Psalms, and that in a way most conducive to ge-
 neral Edification, we must use such Metre and Tunes
 as the People can joyn in: And if the Jews us'd such
 sort of Metre and Tunes as were most known and
 common among them, we may by parity of reason
 choose those that are most familiar to us. And now I
 hope the Bishop will, upon the review, see how little
 reason he had to except against this part of the Remarks,
 when they have really oblig'd him to reform and cor-
 rect his own Rule, and bring it up to that I had laid
 down, tho' to conceal the matter, he has thought fit to
 misunderstand and pervert mine, or rather to copy a
 new one for me.

2. The Bishop alledges, *That I endeavour to persuade*
the Dissenters of his Diocese, that the greatest Exception
against

against joyning with the *establisht Church*, is not the matter of their *Publick ordinary Worship*. On which he makes several Observations.

Before I consider 'em, I must premise that 'tis true, I have told his Lordship that the Contest between the *establisht Church* and *Dissenters*, does not lye chiefly about their ordinary *Lord's-Day Worship*, but what occurs in other *Offices*, and chiefly about the corruptions and abuses of *Discipline*, and 'tis no more than has been frequently suggested by the most judicious N.C. Divines that have wrote on the Subject of our Differences. But why does he pretend that I diwade any Dissenters from joyning with the *establisht Church* (if he mean it concerning all *occasional Communion* with 'em) when I have so expressly declar'd my Judgment for it, and in vain urg'd him to the like declaration of his Charity towards us, and never pretend to alledge our Differences in Reference to *Worship* or *Discipline*, as any Argument against such *occasional Communion* in their ordinary *Lord's-Day Service*. There is no reason then to pervert what I have offer'd to such an uncharitable purpose, so that his following Observations are founded on a mistaken supposition. And therefore I shall content my self with these short Remarks on 'em.

1. I did then, and do still think it requisite to acquaint the Reader, that the Bishop had not in this *Discourse* so much as touch'd the Principal Matters in Difference between the *establisht Church* and the *Dissenters*, and particularly those to which this charge of *Human Inventions* does most properly belong. And whereas he now tells us, that if he writ about *Discipline*, we should be less pleas'd with his performance, *because he must look on the general Frame of our whole Constitution as a meer Human Creature, &c.* I must so far agree with him, that if he treat that Subject in the same manner that he has done this about *Worship*, we shall certainly be less pleas'd with it, because all those faults that occur in the manner of handling this Subject, will be the more aggravated if he repeat 'em on another.

2. Whereas

2. Whereas the Bishop pretends, I desire to *shift ground, and thence presume I apprehend some disadvantage in it.* I do not find he has any reason for such a Triumph for my having avoided the consideration of any thing in his Book that carried the face of an Argument: Nor have I any need to multiply Matters of Controversie from any Answer that his Lordship has yet given to the *Remarks.* *Admon. p. 46.* And whereas he saith, 'That I attempt not to justify their sitting at Prayers, nor their omitting to add their *Amen* to their Prayers, nor the manner and frequency of their Communion, nor their way of singing *Psalms*; I shall only add, That for sitting at Publick Prayer, I was no more oblig'd to defend any particular persons in that posture that indulge it out of sloth, than he to defend the *Toying* or *Laughing*, that's too often us'd in their Churches: But his Lordship was oblig'd, either to defend his charging this upon our Opinion, as if we taught, *That no postures of Reverence may be lawfully us'd; and condemn'd such as standing and kneeling as Relicks of Idolatry;* or else to retract so *harmous Calumnies* as these must be, if they are untrue and groundless. For adding *Amen*, I shan, if that will please the Bishop, concur with him that 'tis more agreeable to Scripture Pattern, that the People pronounce it more audibly; but I hope this omission signifies nothing to his Charge of *Human Inventions.* For the Matter of Celebrating the Lord's-Supper, if it refer to the posture, I hope the Bishop is convinc'd, that *ours* is more agreeable to Scripture Pattern. For the frequency of it, I hope hee'll allow the generality of the Dissenters have much the advantage above the generality of the *Parish Churches* by communicating much oftner. And for what concerns the Practice of the Dissenters in his Diocese, it has been already consider'd in the Account of Matters of Fact, and I have there shewn that their way of Administering it once a year, is equivalent to its being Administred thrice in the *Parish Churches*, as to the frequency of their Members Communicating. And for singing *Psalms*, I have already said enough to shew

him that our Practice needs no *Reformation*, but rather his unreasonable prejudices against this part of Divine Worship, common both to them and us.

3. The Bishop need take no pains to prove, *That my demands about the Reformation of the Discipline of the establisht Church, are not Arguments against all occasional Communion with 'em.* For they were never propos'd for that end; but then I must tell him, That where there are in a Kingdom two Parties, or Bodies of Protestants, in one of whom both the *Worship* and *Discipline* of Christ is more fully restor'd to its primitive simplicity and purity, in the other there are some defects and corruptions left in their *Worship* and *Discipline* almost entirely neglected or perverted and abus'd. I think every considerate Christian should prefer the stated Communion of that Party, in which necessary Reformation has made a happier progress, and those better Reformed Churches, have no reason to subject themselves to those corruptions they have rejected. And moderate and wise men will separate from the Churches of neither Party, as if they were no true Churches, and no part of the Church Catholick, but will rather to shew their regard to *Truth*, more staidly communicate with those on whose side it lies in the Matters in Difference, and yet to express their *Charity*, maintain Occasional Communion with the other, so far as they can do it without Practising what themselves think unlawful.

4. Whereas the Bishop is so much displeased with those *Requests* that I have offer'd to the Conforming Clergy, relating to those Practices wherein we chiefly desire some Reformation of their present Discipline, and thinks me very unreasonable in proposing 'em, and cannot see to what good purpose they can serve; I shall, to give him all the satisfaction I can, acquaint him with the true Reasons of my offering 'em.

1. I take the Abuses, of which some Reformation is there requested, to be the chief Obstacles to that happy Union among us, which has been so long the earnest desire of all good men, and I hope I can most sincerely
say

say my own. So that I think none who have that end in their Eye, can be reasonably blamed for humbly proposing to Publick Consideration so proper and effectual means to attain it; from which I thought his Lordship's *Discourse* had some tendency to divert the minds of men by amusing 'em with a new Dispute of *Human Inventions*. And therefore I thought this a very suitable occasion to lay open the main grounds of our unhappy Differences, that if any charitable Persons should think of any attempts to compose them, they might by a true view of the *Disease* judge of the *Remedy* proper to heal it. And truly, 'till these Corruptions be reform'd, I see as yet little reason to hope for any *concord* in our *practice*, tho' I would hope to see much greater in our mutual *Affections*.

2. I take these to be *abuses*, which the generality of the most judicious and learned, as well as sober and charitable of the Conforming Clergy and Laity are sensible of, and would readily concur in their desires and endeavours to reform, if they had a fair opportunity for it, so that I did not believe these *Requests* would be any matter of just offence to them, nor do I yet find that they are. And for the offence of any that would perpetuate our Divisions, by keeping up those Corruptions that are the chief Engine of 'em, because they are serviceable to their Secular Interest, I think not my self much oblig'd to regard it. The Glory of God, and Concord of Christians are so much more valuable an Interest, that we may justly pursue it, tho' it should clash with the Humours, the Ambition or Avarice of Men, to which too many even of the Clergy, have too long Sacrific'd the more precious Concernments both of the Churches Purity and Peace.

There are two things indeed which the Bishop Accuses those Requests, of which I am concern'd to consider,

1. That some of 'em are founded on most unjust Representations of their Practices and Principles, which if truly Represented needs no Reformation, as may appear (saith he) from his adding to, and Admon. p. 171.

taking from our third and fourth Canons, p. 179. And may further appear in the 2d, 3d, 4th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 12th, and 13th Requests. Now I have review'd all these, and can see no such unjust Representations in 'em. So that I think, his Lordship had been more just, if he had, either never advanced this Charge against me, or had taken the pains to prove it. Particularly, I cannot imagine, wherem I have added to these two Canons, in what I have cited of 'em, or why I must be said to take from 'em, because I only cite that part of 'em, which my Discourse there led me to take notice of.

2. He is pleas'd to intimate, That I give ill Language in those Requests; and to that purpose saith, That I expose the Kingdom and Protestants Inhabitants of it, as again, overspread with Swearing, Profanation of the Lord's Day, Uncleanness, Pride, Luxury, &c. An Imputation (saith he) which I can by no means allow to be general; there being, I am persuaded by the goodness of God, a manifest abatement of these in this Diocese.

Ans. I should be glad to hear of such an Abatement of these Sins in this Diocese, and doubt not if true, that the Dissenting Ministers have been no way negligent to contribute towards it. But if the Bishop deny the Truth of this Complaint, concerning the generality of the Protestants of this Kingdom, as 'tis there deliver'd, he sees with other eyes, than any sober Person I have yet convers'd with. For Swearing and Profanation of the Lord's Day, no good Man can converse in any part of the Kingdom, without being a sorrowful Ear and Eye-witness of it. Nor does there appear any considerable abatement of those other Crimes, from what was before, besides what the diminution of mens Estates have necessitated them to. So that I cannot imagine what ill Language it should be, to mention and lament the revival of these Vices, and request all Ministers to concur in their endeavours, to preserve or reclaim those under their care from 'em. And I fear that the generality of Protestants among us, need the loudest call we can give 'em to Repentance, instead of such an undeserved Commendation as tends to persuade 'em, there

there is not so great and general a necessity of it. The common guilt is too great and too deeply aggravated, to be either conceal'd or extenuated, and deserves a fuller Description and a severer Reproof than I had then occasion for.

III. The third Allegation which the Bishop saith, I use to take off the force of his Book, is, *That he hath omitted to handle that part of the Worship of the establish'd Church, against* Admon. p. 54. *which the Dissenters have the greatest Exception, and particularly what refers to Baptism.*

Ans. I felt no such force in his Book, as needed this new Dispute to take it off. But 'tis true enough, That the Debate about *Human Morities* does more particularly concern *Baptism*, than the other parts of Worship his Lordship had insisted on.

And therefore, since the Bishop has offer'd us something new on this Subject, I shall the more willingly address my self to the Examination of it, because the precedent part of the Admonition, has left the Argument between us almost wholly untouch'd, and contains little but such slight Cavils about it, as were in effect obviated in the *Remarks* themselves. And here

I. The Bishop gives us the Reason why he omitted this part of Worship, viz.

1. "Because it was occasional, not ordinary." Admon. p. 172, 173.

1. *Ans.* But he knew that in a Discourse about the *Intentions of Men in the Worship of God*, it was proper to consider that part of Worship about which that Dispute chiefly lay.

2. "Because he found the Defects and Additions of our Directory to great in this Office, that they deserv'd a Discourse by themselves. And accordingly he mentions these following Defects in the Directory." Admon. p. 173, 174.

1. "There is no express Covenant order'd in the Directory, to be made in the name of the Child Baptiz'd, either by the Parent or any else, nor there be

'no other way of engaging a Child that cannot Covenant for it self.

2. 'There is no Profession of the Christian Faith required in the Directory from any Parent or Offerer of any Child.

3. 'There is no solemn Recognition of the Vow of Baptism required from Persons Baptiz'd in their Infancy, when they come to understand their Duty. As it is in Confirmation with us.

4. 'The express words of the Covenant, are not prescribed out of the Word of God, but is left to the Discretion of every Minister, to impose what he will on the Baptiz'd, &c.

Ans. I know no great harm to the Cause of *Dissenters*, if we should own there are some Omissions in the Directory; especially when the Compilers, to avoid the rigorous and imposing humour, that had too long reign'd in others, seem to have left many things to the discretion of particular Pastors, which they would not positively enjoyn. And for these Defects which the Bishop has cited out of Mr. *Baxter's Treatise of Infant Baptism*, they are not so material as his Lordship seems to imagine, and are easily supplied by every Minister that thinks more express Professions requisite than are there positively enjoyn'd.

As to the first, *The making of an Express Covenant in the name of the Child*, if the Bishop mean by it, that the Parent should explicitly profess his Dedicating his Child to God, and bringing it thereby under a Solemn Obligation to the Duties of his Covenant, this is really included in that Profession he is required by the Directory to make of his *desire to have it Baptiz'd*: and accordingly 'tis usual for the Ministers to propose the Question more fully to this purpose; *Do you profess your desire of having this Child dedicated by Baptism to the Faith, Worship and Service of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?* But if he mean that the Parent or Offerer of the Child should make such a Profession in the Child's name, as our Sponsors are order'd to do in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, 'tis so far from being a Defect in our Directory

rectory that it enjoyns no such thing; that 'tis no small
Blemish of the Office of Baptism in the *Service-Book*,
 that it requires such a Profession from 'em, as *personating*
 the Child they present. And that his Lordship may
 be assured Mr. *Baxter* intended no such *Express Cove-*
nanting in the name of the Child as this is, I shall pro-
 duce his own words (and the rather because I take them
 to carry great weight and force in 'em) in his *N. Confor-*
mity stated, &c. he brings in the *Lawyer* asking, 'What is
 your fourth *Objection* against our way of *Baptism*? To
 which the *Minister* thus *Answers*: That in personating
 the Child, they say, that they (and so he by them) doth
 at present believe, renounce and desire, &c. falsely in-
 timating that Infants are at present bound to do this
 by another. And yet the same Men plead that God
 doth not accept him for the Faith of his Parents, when
 as God requireth no Faith or Repentance of Infants,
 but only that they be the Seed of Penitent Believers
 devoted to Christ. And in the Catechism 'tis said, that
 (*Repentance and Faith are requir'd of Persons to be Bap-*
tiz'd; and that Infants who cannot perform these, are
Baptiz'd because they promise 'em by their Sureties, which
Promise when they come to Age, themselves are bound to
perform.) Where note, that the former *Common-*
Prayer-Book had [*They perform 'em by their Sureties*]
 They perceiv'd that having said Faith and Repentance
 are requisite, Infants they saw must have at present
 what is requisite at present. And they knew that they
 had them not themselves, and so were fain to hold
 that the Sureties Faith and Repentance was theirs,
 and a performance of that requir'd Condition. But
 the Makers of the new Book saw that this would not
 hold, and so they say, "[Tho' Faith and Repentance
 be requir'd of Persons to be Baptiz'd, yet Infants are
 Baptiz'd because they promise 'em by their Sureties to
 be hereafter perform'd.] amending the former *Errour*
 by a greater or a double one: 1. Granting Faith and
 Repentance are pre-requisite, and yet confessing that
 Infants have neither of their own or Sureties for 'em,
 and yet are to be Baptiz'd. 2. Or making a Promise
 of

Future Faith and Repentance to be Present Faith and Repentance. 3. Of tho' Faith and Repentance be requisite in those that are to be Baptiz'd, yet God will at present justify and save all that have it not in Infancy, because they promise it hereafter. All plain Contradictions; as if they said, 'Tis requisite in Persons to be Baptiz'd, and 'tis not requisite. L. How would you have 'em have answer'd these? M. Professed Faith and Repentance are requisite in adult Persons to be Baptiz'd; and in Infants, that they be the Seed of the Faithful, devoted by them to God in Christ, according to his offer'd Covenant of Grace.

Thus far that accurate Divine, from whom his Lordship may learn, That the modesty of the Compilers of the *Directory*, which made their Orders about this Matter, seem defective by leaving some Particulars to the prudence and liberty of particular Ministers, is far more excusable, than the assurance of those who impose in such solemn Professions, things so confus'd and inconsistent. If there be any defect in their Orders, 'tis easily supplied; but the mistakes of the *Service-Book* are remedilessly impos'd on all that Administer this Ordinance according to it.

For the *second* Defect, viz. 'That there is in the *Directory* no Profession of the Christian Faith requir'd from the Parent or Officer of any Child; I think there is such a virtual Profession requir'd by the *Directory*, when it enjoyns the Minister to require from the Parent, a solemn Promise to bring up his Child in the knowledge of the Grounds of the Christian Religion, and in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord. For this implys his owning himself the Christian Religion; besides that his being a known Professor of it, is presuppos'd to his Childrens Admission to that Ordinance. Nor does the *Directory* hinder the Minister from requiring a more express Profession from the Parent, of the Christian Faith, where it is doubtful whether he own it or no. And I am sure the Form of Baptism drawn up by the N. C. Divines at the *Savoy-Conference*, in their Proposals for Accommodation, does expressly require it; and

I have observ'd it ordinarily requir'd, at least in general terms.

For the *third* and *fourth* Defects of the *Directory*, 'That there is no solemn Recognition of the Vow of Baptism requir'd of Persons Baptiz'd in Infancy, when they come to understand their Duty, as there is in the Confirmation practis'd in the establish'd Church; and that the express words of the Covenant are not prescribed out of the Word of God. Tho' I take this to be an Omission, and therefore have both my self practis'd, and known many others practise that Confirmation recommended in the *Reformed Liturgy*, drawn up by the N. C. Divines at the *Savoy-Conference*, (according to which no Person Baptiz'd is admitted to the Lord's Supper, till at years of discretion, not only understand the Baptismal Covenant, but with his own mouth, and with his own consent openly before the Church, ratifie and confirm it, and promise his faithful observance of it to the end. In which Liturgy there is also an excellent Form of the Baptismal Covenant, drawn up as agreeable to the Scripture as any I have yet seen) yet I think this Omission of the *Directory*, far more excusable than what the *Common-Prayer-Book* imposes in reference to Confirmation, of which they have both made something too like a Sacrament, and also turn'd a very useful practice, and agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture into a *Childish Formality*, as I had occasion to shew in the *Remarks*. 'Tis easier to supply such Defects, than to remove such unreasonable Impositions.

I shall conclude this Head, with observing that the Bishop has, of all Men, the least reason to blame the *Directory* for these Defects: For unless he could produce express Scriptural Precepts or Pattern, for these things, which he saith the *Directory* has omitted, (as I think no Man can do it) he must, according to his former Principles, censure 'em for *Human Inventions*, and rather commend the *Directory* for omitting them.

For the Bishops Charge against the *Directory*, for requiring Additional Conditions contrary to Scripture Presidents,

Presidents, of which he gives us only one Instance, viz.

Its ordering that Baptism be not Administred in private Places, but in the place of Publick Worship, and in the face of the Congregation.

I suppose the Bishop will grant that it should ordinarily be Administred in Publick; and if these words of the *Directory* were intended in the strictest sense they are capable of, I am sure the generality of Dissenters have receded from the rigour of this Rule.

II. The Bishop comes to shew that my Argument against the Cross is of no force.

Of this he only gives us this short Account, *Admon. p. 175. His great Objection against it is, That we make a new Human Sacrament, and then it must be a Human Invention.* And upon this the Bishop proceeds to give us a new Account of his own concerning the Nature of a Sacrament, and endeavours to shew that the Cross is not made a Sacrament by 'em, according to that Account. Now tho' I should have thought it fairer to have propos'd the Argument in the same manner I had done, yet in order to the bringing this Debate to some issue, I shall do these two things.

1. I shall set the Argument I had propos'd against the *Cross in Baptism*, in its due light, by giving as distinct and clear an Account as I can, of the Nature of those Parts of Positive Worship which we call Sacraments, and applying it to the Subject in dispute.

2. I shall shew the insufficiency of the Bishop's Answer to this Argument.

1. I shall set the Argument I had propos'd against the *Cross in Baptism* in its due light, by giving a distinct and clear Account of the Nature of those Parts of Positive Worship which we call Sacraments, and applying it to the Subject in dispute.

And this is the more necessary, not only because the uncertain signification of the word *Sacrament* has involv'd this Subject in great obscurity and confusion, but especially because the Account which the Bishop gives of it, (when he supposes us ill-instructed in it, and proposes to inform us better) seems to me not only indistinct,

indistinct, but also very *lame* and *defective*, omitting several considerable uses of Sacraments, which were the chief strength of this Argument against the *Cross*.

There are two Ordinances of Positive Worship prescrib'd in the New Testament, viz. *Baptism* and the *Lord's-Supper*: There have been two Names invented and frequently us'd among Christian Writers, to signify the common nature of these two Institutions, that of *Mysteries* in the Greek Church, and that of *Sacraments* in the Latin, a word probably borrow'd from the Military *Oath* which Soldiers took with certain Rites appointed for that end, and which was call'd the *Military Sacrament*. But 'tis the thing it self we are concern'd to enquire into. Now if we can fix upon the true general Notion, wherein these two Ordinances of *Baptism* and the *Lord's-Supper* agree, we may thence easily infer what a *Divine Sacrament* is: For of that I am now speaking.

And if we attentively consider this Matter, we may soon observe, that those two Ordinances of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* agree in this, that they are *Federal Rites*, or *Sacred Ceremonies instituted by God for Publick Solemnizing the Covenant between him and us*. And on the other hand, in this they differ, that the former is the Sacred Rite, whereby that Covenant is first publickly *Enter'd* into; the latter is that whereby 'tis *Renew'd*. And accordingly these Positive Institutions under the Gospel, succeed in the place of two parallel Ordinances, or *federal Rites* under the *Old Testament*, viz. *Circumcision* and the *Feasts upon Sacrifices*. By the former the *Israelites* were initiated into that Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Seed: By the latter their League of Amity and Peace with God, was (upon the Attonement made by Sacrifices) *renew'd by these Feasts* upon 'em. Of which more may occur anon.

Now these Sacred Rites that are appointed by God, both in our first publick *Entrance* into the Covenant, and our publick *Renewal* of it at the *Lord's Table*, are design'd for several uses, and principally for the three following.

1. *As representing signs for Instruction.*
2. *As obliging signs to Confirm and Ratify the Covenant Enter'd into.*
3. *As distinguishing Signs or Badges of our Profession, and the Relations we thereby are invested in.*

All these uses of 'em must be carefully and distinctly consider'd.

1. These Sacred Rites are us'd in these two Ordinances, as *Representing Signs for Instruction.* (The infinitely wise God condescending herein to our infirmity and weakness.)

Thus *washing with Water*, which is the Rite appointed in *Baptism*, is by its resemblance *instruction* to us, both concerning the *Privileges* and *Duties* of the Covenant we enter into.

Concerning the *Privileges*, Thus 'tis design'd to represent our *Natural pollution* and *defilement*, and the necessity of the *Regenerating* and *Purifying* Virtue of the *Holy Spirit*. And hence we are

3 *John* 5. said to be *born of Water and the Holy Spirit*, i. e. formed to a new and divine Life by that sanctifying efficacy of the *Holy Spirit*, which is compar'd to the purifying Virtue of *Water*. And elsewhere in allusion to this Baptismal Rite, we are said to be *Saved by the Laver of Regeneration, and the Ransoming of the Holy Ghost*, 2 *Tim* 5.

Nay, this Rite seems also design'd to instruct us concerning our *Guilt*, as well as *Pollution*, and of the necessity of our being *Clean'd* from it by the *Laver* of our Mediatour's Blood. For the most judicious Expositors understand those words of *Ananias* concerning the *Remission of Sins*, when he saith to *Saul* upon his Conversion, *Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins*, (or he thou wash from thy Sins, *ἐμαρτύρου*) calling on the Name of the Lord *Jesus*, 22 *Acts* 16. And accordingly such a cleansing virtue is ascrib'd to the Redeemer's blood, and that Expression of his *Washing us from our Sins*, in it, seems to carry an Allusion to this Sacred Baptismal Rite. See 1 *John* 1. 7. 1 *Rev* 5.

The same Sacred Rite is designed to represent our Duty to us, viz. To renounce the Desires of Sin and of the World, and to consecrate our selves to a Life of Holiness, as Christ's purified peculiar People. And this use of it the Bishop omits in his Account. To this Rite those Expressions seem to refer, *Such were some of you, but ye are washed, ye are sanctified*, 1 Cor. 6. 11. And thus the Apostle supposes in our Baptism, that there is a Resemblance of our *Dying with Christ*, and our *Rising with him*, that should instruct us in our Duty, to *Dye to Sin*, and *Live to Righteousness*, 6 Rom. 3. 4. 7. 2 Col. 12. For our *Dying to Sin* and *Walking in newness of Life*, is not signified in Baptism as the Benefit confer'd by God, as the Bishop seems to suppose, but rather as the Duty requir'd from us, tho' the renewing and purifying efficacy of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are enabled to do so, is signify'd as a Benefit which we receive from God.

The same I might observe concerning that other Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, in whose Sacred Rites there is not only a *Commemorative Representation* of the *Death of Christ*, but also an *Instructive Representation* of our *Spiritual Communion with him in his Body and Blood*, (viz. in the precious Fruits of his Sacrifice,) and of those Duties or Exercises of our Faith and Devotion to him, by which we are said to *Eat his Flesh and Drink his Blood*, 6 John 53. 54.

I might observe the same concerning those two parallel Institutions under the Old Testament, *Circumcision* and *Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices*. But this use of Sacraments being so obvious, I shall not insist any farther upon it, but only add, That tho' I suppose all *Sacramental Signs* to be *Representing* ones, and to carry such an *Instructive Resemblance and Allusion*, yet I do not suppose all barely *instructive Signs* to be *Sacramental* or *Federal* ones. For there seems to be more requisite to such

2. The Sacred Rites in *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* are intended also as *obliging Signs to Confirm and Ratify that Covenant that is then Enter'd into or Renew'd between God and us.*

E

Tis

It is evidently so in *Baptism*; for the Sacred Rite there us'd is both,

1. *An obliging Sign on God's part*; whereby he confirms and ratifies the Promises of his Covenant to all that are interest'd therein, even that grand comprehensive Promise of being the *God of the Faithful, and of their Seed*, and particularly that eminent Promise of the *Remission of Sins*. See 17 Gen. 7, 11, and compare it with 2 Act: 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptiz'd every one of you for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost; for the Promise is to you and your Children, &c.* And our being Baptiz'd into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, implys his engagement to be a reconcil'd Father, Redeemer and Sanctifier, to all that sincerely devote themselves to him.

So in that other Federal Rite of the 22 Luke 20. *Lord's Supper*, tis said of the Cup, That 'tis the *New Testament in the Blood of Christ*, i. e. This Sacred Memorial of his Blood is like an Authentick Seal set to the New Testament, wherein so many precious Legacies are convey'd to us as the Fruits of his Death and Sacrifice.

And the same may also be observ'd concerning *Circumcision*, both in the place fore-quoted 17 Gen. 7, 11 — and in its being call'd by the Apostle Paul the *Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, (*viz.* of that right to impunity and life, which Abraham was as a Believer entitl'd to thro' the Merits of that Redeemer, who was his promised Seed) 4 Rom. 11.

So in their Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices, God's admitting the Offerers or Guests to his Table, was a solemn Ratification of the League of Amity and Peace renew'd between em, thro' the virtue of that future atoning Sacrifice of Christ, of which the Legal ones were only Types and Figures.

2. This Sacred Rite of *washing with Water in Baptism*, is no less an obliging Sign from us to God, whereby we bind our selves to the Duties of his Covenant.

Now

Now this important use of a Sacrament, the Bishop not only omits in his Description of it, but plainly denies that it belongs to its nature. For *Admon. p. 180.* he asserts it to be a Mistake concerning Sacraments, to suppose *That they are Signs from us to God*; whereas he asserts 'em to be wholly (for only) *Signs from God to us*: I confess this seems very surprising, because if this be a Mistake, 'tis such a Mistake as he himself has run into in his *Discourse*: For there *p. 4.* he gives this reason, Why the Celebration of the Sacraments is a part of Outward Worship, viz. because in them we not only express our dependence on God for his grace; but likewise oblige and bind our selves to serve him. Now how this can be true, without making the Sacramental Rite a *Sign from us to God*, of that obligation to his Service, I cannot comprehend. So that his Lordship seems to me in this Particular inconsistent with himself, and speaks more accurately of these Matters, where his Partiality to his Cause does not mislead his Judgment. But since he now asserts this to be a Mistake, and demands some place of Scripture to prove this Notion, of a Sacraments being a *Sign from us to God*, (*See Admon. p. 180.*) I shall endeavour herein to give him all reasonable satisfaction.

And this Account of Sacraments I shall particularly prove, in reference to *Baptism*, which is the Sacrament in dispute.

That *Baptism* is a *Sign from us to God* of our Obligation to the Duties of his Covenant, as well as a *Sign from God to us* of the Truth of his Promises, is evident from the Apostle *Peter's* excellent Description of that Internal and Saving *Baptism* which the External *Washing* is the Sign of, viz. *That 'tis not the putting away the filth of the Flesh*, (i. e. *Baptism* is not merely or principally that) but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God: Which words manifestly allude to the Covenant Transaction that passes between the great God and the Adult Person baptiz'd, (for of such the Apostle here speaks) and to the Questions that were to that end propos'd to such as receiv'd

receiv'd this Seal of God's Covenant. They were ask'd, *If they believ'd in the Lord Jesus with all their hearts?* (See 8 Acts 37.) or, as some ancient Christian Writers propose the Question, *'If they reckon'd the Devil and his Angels, the World and its Pompes?* *If they believ'd in, If they devoted themselves to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?* &c. And their sincere Profession and Promise of doing so, which in *Baptism* they ratified by this External Rite of Washing with Water, is that which the Apostle here calls the *Answer of a good Conscience towards God*. So that the Apostle was so far from supposing that *Baptism* was not a *Sign from us to God*, that he rather defines it by this part of its end and use, *viz.* To be a Solemn Rite whereby we profess to engage our Hearts to the Duties of his Covenant. And indeed since *Baptism* is the Solemnizing a mutual Covenant between the Blessed God on the one part, and our Selves or our Seed on the other, it is first a *Sign from us to God*, of our Consent to the proposed Terms of his Covenant, before it can be a *Sign from him to us*, of our or our Childrens interest in those Benefits of his Covenant that presuppose our consent as the Condition thereof. 'Tis the *Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins*, 1 Mark 4. and is therefore first a *Sign of our Repentance towards God*, before it can be a *Sign from him of the Remission of Sins*. And so 'tis propos'd by the Apostle Peter at the first time we read of its Administration to his Adult Converts, 2 Acts 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Christ for the Remission of Sins, for the Promise is unto you and your Children*. Where they were by *Baptism* first to profess their Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus, and then receive the promised Benefit, *Remission of Sins*. Nay, Christ's own Command to his Apostles, first, to *Disciple or Preach to all Nations*, and then to *Baptize 'em*, plainly implies that one great use of *Baptism* was to be a solemn Bond upon 'em, to the Duties of that Christian Profession they had embrac'd, and the *Baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, has been always suppos'd to imply a Solemn Dedication of 'em,

in by this Sacred Rite to the Faith, Worship, and Service of that Blessed Trinity, into whose Name they are Baptized. There is in that Institution a Seal set to the Covenant of God on our part, as well as on his: To which 'tis not improbable that those words of the Apostle Paul refer, *2 Tim. 2. 19.* — *Nevertheless the Foundation (or as some render the word ^{Septuagint} Tabula contracta, the Covenant) of God stands sure, having this Seal (on God's part) The Lord knows them that are his; and (this Seal on our part) Let him that names the Name of Christ depart from iniquity.* As the Covenant is mutual, so the External Rite is intended to ratifie our *Religulacion* as well as God's Promise, and accordingly our breach of the Baptifmal Covenant by Apostasie or Infidelity is Perjury, and therefore so often in the Scripture Language represented by the breach of the Conjugal Vow, that the Adulterers is guilty of. And this Notion of Baptism as an *obliging Sign from God to us*, is the more unreasonably deny'd by the Bishop, if we consider, that 'tis this very use of Baptism, that chiefly occasion'd the Name of a Sacrament being given to it, because Baptism was reckon'd (like the Military Oath of the Roman Soldiers) as a solemn Lifting the Person Baptiz'd into the Service and Warfare of Christ against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. So that the Bishop has excluded that from the nature and notion of a Sacrament, which was the chief, if not the only ground, of this Rite of the Christian Religion being called one.

And it were as easie to shew the same concerning the other Institutions that are call'd *Sacraments*. Thus as Circumcision was a Token of the Covenant between God and Abraham and his Seed in their Generations; so 'twas an *obliging Sign* on their part, as well as on God's part. It oblig'd them to receive and obey the Revelations of the Divine Will to 'em. And hence, after the delivery of the Law of Moses, Circumcision was an External Bond on those that receiv'd it to observe that Law; as the Apostle Paul plainly intimates to us, *1 Gal. 3.* — *He that was Circumcised made him*

1. *As representing signs for Instruction.*
 2. *As obliging signs to Confirm and Ratify the Covenant Enter'd into.*

3. *As distinguishing Signs or Badges of our Profession, and the Relations we thereby are invested in.*

All these uses of 'em must be carefully and distinctly consider'd.

1. These Sacred Rites are us'd in these two Ordinances, as *Representing Signs for Instruction.* (The infinitely wise God condescending herein to our infirmity and weakness.)

Thus *washing with Water*, which is the Rite appointed in *Baptism*, is by its resemblance instructive to us, both concerning the *Privileges* and *Duties* of the Covenant we enter into.

Concerning the *Privileges*, Thus 'tis design'd to represent our *Natural pollution* and defilement, and the necessity of the *Regenerating* and *Purifying* Virtue of the *Holy Spirit*. And hence we are

3 *John* 5. said to be born of *Water* and the *Holy Spirit*, i. e. formed to a new and di-

vine Life by that sanctifying efficacy of the *Holy Spirit*, which is compar'd to the purifying Virtue of *Water*. And elsewhere in allusion to this Baptismal Rite, we are said to be *Saved by the Laver of Regeneration, and the Ransoming of the Holy Ghost*, *2 Tit.* 5.

Nay, this Rite seems also design'd to instruct us concerning our *Guilt*, as well as *Pollution*, and of the necessity of our being *Clean'd* from it by the *Laver* of our *Mediatour's Blood*. For the most judicious Expositors understand those words of *Anania* concerning the *Remission of Sins*, when he saith to *Saul* upon his Conversion, *Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins*, (for he thou wast from thy Sins, *Expiation*), calling on the *Name of the Lord Jesus*, *22 Acts* 16. And accordingly such a *cleansing* virtue is ascrib'd to the *Redeemer's blood*, and that Expression of his *Washing us from our Sins*, in it, seems to carry an Allusion to this Sacred Baptismal Rite. See *1 John* 1. 7. *1 Rev.* 5.

The same Sacred Rite is designed to represent our Duty to us, viz. To renounce the Desires of Sin and of the World, and to consecrate our selves to a Life of Holiness, as Christ's purified peculiar People. And this use of it the Bishop omits in his Account. To this Rite those Expressions seem to refer, *Such were some of you, but ye are washed, ye are sanctified*, 1 Cor. 6. 11. And thus the Apostle supposes in our Baptism, that there is a Resemblance of our *Dying with Christ, and our Rising with him*, that should instruct us in our Duty, *to Dye to Sin, and Live to Righteousness*, 6 Rom. 3. 4. 5. 2 Col. 12. For our *Dying to Sin and Walking in newness of Life*, is not signified in Baptism as the Benefit confer'd by God, as the Bishop seems to suppose, but rather as the Duty requir'd from us, tho' the renewing and purifying efficacy of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are enabled to do so, is signify'd as a Benefit which we receive from God.

The same I might observe concerning that other Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, in whose Sacred Rites there is not only a *Commemorative Representation* of the *Death of Christ*, but also an *Instructive Representation* of our *Spiritual Communion with him in his Body and Blood*, (viz. in the precious Fruits of his Sacrifice,) and of those Duties or Exercises of our Faith and Devotion to him, by which we are said to *Eat his Flesh and Drink his Blood*, 6 John 53. 54.

I might observe the same concerning those two parallel Institutions under the Old Testament, *Circumcision* and *Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices*. But this use of Sacraments being so obvious, I shall not insist any farther upon it, but only add, That tho' I suppose all *Sacramental Signs* to be *Representing ones*, and to carry such an *Instructive Resemblance and Allusion*, yet I do not suppose all barely *instructive Signs* to be *Sacramental* or *Federal ones*. For there seems to be more requisite to such

2. The Sacred Rites in *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* are intended also as *obliging Signs to Confirm and Ratify that Covenant that is then Enter'd into or Renew'd between God and us*. B Tis

It is evidently so in *Baptism*; for the Sacred Rite there us'd is both,

1. *An obliging Sign on God's part*; whereby he confirms and ratifies the Promises of his Covenant to all that are interest'd therein, even that grand comprehensive Promise of being the God of the Faithful, and of their Seed, and particularly that eminent Promise of the Remission of Sins. See 17 Gen. 7, 11. and compare it with 2 Act. 38, 39. Repent and be Baptiz'd every one of you for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost: for the Promise is to you and your Children, &c. And our being Baptiz'd into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, implies his engagement to be a reconcil'd Father, Redeemer and Sanctifier, to all that sincerely devote themselves to him.

So in that other Federal Rite of the 22 Luke 20. Lord's Supper, 'tis said of the Cup, That 'tis the New Testament in the Blood of Christ, i. e. This Sacred Memorial of his Blood is like an Authentick Seal set to the New Testament, wherein so many precious Legacies are convey'd to us as the Fruits of his Death and Sacrifice.

And the same may also be observ'd concerning Circumcision, both in the place fore-quoted 17 Gen. 7, 11. and in its being call'd by the Apostle Paul the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, (viz. of that right to impunity and life, which Abraham was as a Believer entitled to thro' the Merits of that Redeemer, who was his promised Seed) 4 Rom. 11.

So in their Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices, God's admitting the Offerers or Guests to his Table, was a solemn Ratification of the League of Amity and Peace renew'd between em, thro' the virtue of that future atoning Sacrifice of Christ, of which the Legal ones were only Types and Figures.

2. This Sacred Rite of washing with Water in Baptism, is no less an obliging Sign from us to God, whereby we bind our selves to the Duties of his Covenant.

Now

Now this Important use of a Sacrament, the Bishop
 not only omits in his Description of it, but plainly de-
 nies that it belongs to its nature. For *Admon. p. 180.*
 He asserts it to be a Mistake concerning Sacraments, to
 suppose *(That they are Signs from us to God)*; whereas he
 affirms 'em to be *wholly* (for only) *Signs from God to us*;
 I confess this seems very surprising, because if this be a
 Mistake, 'tis such a Mistake as he himself has run into
 in his *Discourse*. For there *p. 11* he gives this reason,
 Why the Celebration of the Sacraments is a part of
 our Outward Worship, viz. because in them we not only
 express our dependence on God for his grace; but
 likewise oblige and bind our selves to serve him.
 Now how this can be true, without making the Sacra-
 mental Rite a *Sign from us to God*, of that obligation to
 his Service, I cannot comprehend. So that his Lord-
 ship seems to me in this Particular inconsistent with
 himself, and speaks more accurately of these Matters,
 where his Partiality to his Cause does not mislead his
 Judgment. But since he now asserts this to be a Mi-
 stake, and demands some place of Scripture to prove
 this Notion, of a Sacraments being a *Sign from us to*
God, (See *Admon. p. 180.*) I shall endeavour herein to
 give him all reasonable satisfaction.
 And this Account of Sacraments I shall particularly
 prove, in reference to Baptism, which is the Sacrament
 in dispute.
 That Baptism is a *Sign from us to God* of our Obliga-
 tion to the Duties of his Covenant, as well as a *Sign from*
God to us of the Truth of his Promises, is evident from the Apostle Peter's ex-
 cellent Description of that Internal and
 Saving Baptism which the External Washing is the Sign
 of, viz. That 'tis not the putting away the filth of the
 Flesh, (i. e. Baptism is not merely or principally that)
 but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, Which
 words manifestly allude to the Covenant Transaction
 that passes between the great God and the Adult Person
 baptiz'd. (for of such the Apostle here speaks) and to
 the Questions that were to that end propos'd to such as

receiv'd this Seal of God's Covenant. They were ask'd, *If they believ'd in the Lord Jesus with all their hearts?* (See 8 Acts 37.) or, as some ancient Christian Writers propose the Question, *If they reconc'd the Devil and his Angels, the World and its Pompe?* If they believ'd in, If they devoted themselves to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost &c. And their sincere Profession and Promise of doing so, which in *Baptism* they ratified by this External Rite of Washing with Water, is that which the Apostle here calls the *Answer of a good Conscience towards God*. So that the Apostle was so far from supposing that *Baptism* was not a *Sign from us to God*, that he rather defines it by this part of its end and use, *viz.* To be a Solemn Rite whereby we profess to engage our Hearts to the Duties of his Covenant. And indeed since *Baptism* is the Solemnizing a mutual Covenant between the Blessed God on the one part, and our Selves or our Seed on the other, it is first a *Sign from us to God*, of our Consent to the proposed Terms of his Covenant, before it can be a *Sign from him to us*, of our or our Childrens interest in those Benefits of his Covenant that presuppose our consent as the Condition thereof. 'Tis the *Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins*, 1 Mark 4. and is therefore first a *Sign of our Repentance towards God*, before it can be a *Sign from him of the Remission of Sins*. And so 'tis propos'd by the Apostle Peter at the first time we read of its Administration to his Adult Converts, 2 Acts 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Christ for the Remission of Sins, for the Promise is unto you and your Children*. Where they were by Baptism first to profess their Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus, and then receive the promised Benefit, *Remission of Sins*. Nay, Christ's own Command to his Apostles, first to *Disciple or Proselyte all Nations*, and then to *Baptize 'em*, plainly implys that one great use of *Baptism* was to be a solemn Bond upon 'em, to the Duties of that Christian Profession they had embrac'd, and the *Baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, has been always suppos'd to imply a Solemn Dedication of 'em,

Ym by this Sacred Rite to the Faith, Worship, and Service of that Blessed Trinity, into whose Name they are Baptized. There is in that Institution a Seal set to the Covenant of God on our part, as well as on his: To which 'tis not improbable that those words of the Apostle Paul refer, 2 Tim. 2. 19. — *Nevertheless the Foundation (or as some render the word *infirmum*, Tabula contractilis, the Covenant) of God stands sure, having this Seal (on God's part) The Lord knows them that are his; and (this Seal on our part) Lies him that names the Name of Christ, depart from iniquity.* As the Covenant is mutual, so the External Rite is intended to ratifie our Regeneration as well as God's Promise, and accordingly our breach of the Baptismal Covenant by Apostasy or Infidelity is Perjury, and therefore so often in the Scripture Language represented by the breach of the Conjugal Vow, that the Adulteress is guilty of. And this Notion of Baptism as an *obliging Sign from God* as *we* is the more unreasonably deny'd by the Bishop, if we consider, that 'tis this very use of Baptism, that chiefly occasion'd the Name of a Sacrament being given to it, because Baptism was reckon'd (like the Military Oath of the Roman Soldiers) as a solemn Lifting the Person Baptiz'd into the Service and Warfare of Christ against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. So that the Bishop has excluded that from the nature and notion of a Sacrament, which was the chief, if not the only ground, of this Rite of the Christian Religion being called *one*.

And it were as easie to shew the same concerning the other Institutions that are call'd *Sacraments*. Thus as *Circumcision* was a Token of the Covenant between God and Abraham and his Seed in their Generations; so 'twas an *obliging Sign* on their part, as well as on God's part. It oblig'd them to receive and obey the Revelations of the Divine Will to 'em. And hence, after the delivery of the Law of Moses, Circumcision was an External Bond on those that receiv'd it to observe that Law; as the Apostle Paul plainly intimates to us, 1 Gal. 3. — *He that was Circumcised, binds himself*

self a Debtor to the Law to do it; and brought himself under a solemn Eye thereto by this External Rite.

That the Feasts upon Sacrifices under the Law were Federal Rites (in allusion to the general Custom of those Eastern Nations, to Confirm mutual Covenances by Eating and Drinking together; See 26 Gen. 30, 31, 31 Gen. 44, 45, 46. 9 Job. 14, 41 Psalm 9. 9 Lam. 6. Obad. 7. v.) is so largely prov'd by the Learned Dr. Cal-
worth in his excellent Treatise on the Lord's Supper, and Feasts upon a Sacrifice, that I must refer the Reader to it for fuller satisfaction. And that one passage in the

50 Psalm v. 5. is sufficient to put it out of doubt; Gather my Saints together, those that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice. Now the Covenant was made and celebrated, not merely by Offering it up, but chiefly by their Religious Feasts upon it.

And as the Lord's Supper succeeds in the place and stead of those Jewish Feasts upon Sacrifices, so it is evidently design'd as such a Federal Rite, whereby we renew our League of Peace with God, upon the Memorials of the Attoning Sacrifice of his own Son, by our renewed Consent to the Terms of his Covenants. And hence the Apostle Paul warns his Corinthian Converts against the Idolatrous Practice of Feasting in the Temples of the Heathen Idols, as inconsistent with the Obligations which their Feasting at the Lord's Table had laid upon 'em to be the Worshippers of the only true God, who was too jealous of his own Honor to admit of any Rival in it. See 1 Cor. 10 ch. from the fourteenth to the twenty third verse.

3. These Federal Rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper must be consider'd as intended also to be distinguishing Signs of our Christian Profession, and the Relations which we are thereby invested in.

Thus our Baptism is the honourable Badge of our Discipleship, whereby we are discriminated from the Infidel World. We do hereby put on the Livery of Christ, (as those words of the Apostle Paul imply Gal. 2. 27. For as many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.) And therefore he adds, they were

were no more to be distinguish'd into Jew or Gent. See
but all were one in Christ Jesus. This one *Leaven* was
 to be the common Sign of their belonging to him as their
 one Lord and Master. And accordingly our partaking
 of one External Baptism, is made a Mark and Chara-
 cter of those that belong'd to that one visible Body, or
 Church of which Christ is the Lord and Head, as our
 partaking of one Internal Baptism is the certain Mark
 of our belonging to the one invisible Church, or mystical
 Body of Christ. See 1 *Eph.* 4, 5, 6. To the same
 purpose we read elsewhere, that *we are by one Spirit*
baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles,
whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to
drink into one Spirit. The latter words, of being *made*
to drink into one Spirit, according to the general con-
 sent of the best Expositors, refer to the Lord's Supper,
 as the former do to Baptism. And the words plainly
 imply, that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the Sym-
 bol and the Bond of our External Communion, as Mem-
 bers of the visible Church, as by partaking of the san-
 ctifying Operations of the same Holy Spirit, we become
 Members of one mystical Body of Christ. So that by
 our Baptism we are incorporated into the Christian
 Community, and thereby discriminated in our right to
 its External Privileges from them that are without,
 who are yet *Aliens and Foreigners.* And so by the Lord's
 Supper we are, as *partakers of Christ's Holy Table,* distin-
 guish'd from them that *partake of the Table of Devils,*
 and are in *fellowship (or Communion) with them* —
 1 *Cor.* 10. 20, 21.

Thus was Circumcision the discriminating Mark of
 these that embrac'd the Faith of Abraham, from such
 as were *Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and*
Strangers to the Covenants of Promise. Circumcised and
 Uncircumcised was equivalent to one that did, or did
 not own the Jewish Religion.

Having thus far clear'd the general *Nature and Uses*
 of these two Institutions in the Christian Religion which
 we call *Sacraments,* (for all the particular uses of each
 of 'em, I am not now concern'd to consider) I come to
 apply this Account to the Matter in Debate,

And accordingly, 'tis obvious to any that shall consider the foregoing Account, that there is one *Use* of these *Federal or Sacramental Rites* that does necessarily presuppose Divine Institution, viz. *Their being obliging signs on God's part to ratifie his Promises.* For it were too absurd for any to imagine that God will oblige himself by signs he never appointed for that end. And therefore the Papists themselves pretend their new Sacraments to be *Divine* ones, by feigning God's Institution for 'em.

When therefore I speak of a *Human Sacrament*, I mean no more by it, 'than an *External Rite* set up by meer Human Authority, without any pretence of Divine Institution, for several *Sacramental Uses*, such as constitute it as truly a part of Religious Worship as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are. So that it wants nothing but God's Instituting it to be a *Seal* to his part of the Covenant, as Men have made it a *Seal* to their part, to render it as proper a *Sacrament* as either of the two former. And 'tis only in this sense that I suppose the Cross to be made a *Human Sacrament* by the establish'd Church. 'Tis made by 'em a *Sacrament*, as far as Men can make one of a Religious Rite that they can pretend no Divine Authority for. And this is sufficient to prove it a sinful Human Invention, as I shall now show, in prosecuting the Particulars here suggested.

I. The Cross is set up for several *Sacramental Uses*, even the like *Uses* as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are appointed for.

For according to the foregoing Account of these *Federal or Sacramental Rites*,

1. 'Tis set up as a *Representing or Instructive sign*. And that both in the Duties and the Benefits of the New Covenant.

'Tis set up as *Instructive* in the Duties of it. And this the Bishop grants when he owns, (*Admon. p. 178.*) 'That the Cross is us'd to signify the Return we ought to make to God, for the Benefits receiv'd in Baptism. And indeed the words of the *Service-Book* put this out of doubt: *We sign this Child, &c. in token that he shall*

not be ashamed to Confess the Faith of Christ crucified,
See.

It is set up as *Instructive* in the Benefits of the New Covenant. This indeed the Bishop denies in the place last quoted; and tells us, *The Cross is not us'd by us to signify any Grace or Benefit communicated from God.* But I think there is just ground to conclude the contrary from the Reason which the Convocation alledges for Retaining the use of the *Sign of the Cross*, viz. That the Holy Ghost by the Mouth of the Apostles did honour the name of the Cross so far, that under it he comprehended not only Christ crucified, but the force, effect and merit of his Death and Passion, with all the comforts, fruits and promises we receive or expect thereby. See the Thirtieth Canon of the Church of England. Now I would gladly know what this Reason can signify, to vindicate their retaining the use of the *Cross*, unless they supposed it a fit external Sign to signify the same things which the Holy Ghost had honour'd the Name of the Cross to signify. And this Inference seems the more just, from the account they give of this Ceremony of *Crossing*, as practis'd by the Primitive Christians, viz. That they signed their Children with the Sign of the Cross when they were Christen'd, to dedicate 'em by that Badge to his Service, whose Benefits bestow'd on 'em in Baptism, the name of the Cross did represent. And consequently, the Sign of it is design'd to represent too.

But,

2. Which is more considerable, The Cross is made by the establish'd Church an *obliging and ratifying sign on our part*, to bind us to the Duties of God's Covenant, even to the same which Baptism is appointed to oblige us to, viz. *To confess boldly the Faith of Christ crucified, To fight manfully under his Banner against the Flesh, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Christ's faithful Soldiers and Servants to our lives end.* And I may still renew the Question propos'd in the Remark, *What more peculiar Duties of the New Covenant could Baptism oblige us to?* And to put the matter, if possible, out of doubt,

doubt, the Infant is expressly said in the Canon to be by this Badge dedicated to the Service of Christ. I know indeed the ingenious Author of the Case relating to the Cross in Baptism, distinguishes here between an *improper* and *declarative* Dedication, and accordingly would persuade us that the Convocation only design'd the latter a partly, because they refer to the words us'd in the Service Book when the Child is cross'd, partly because they suppose the Child dedicated by Baptism before, and suppose Baptism compleat without the sign of the Cross.

But I see not that either of these Reasons warrant us to make the words of the Convocation in so very strain'd and improper a sense as this is. That when they affirm the Cross to be a lawful outward Ceremony, and honourable Badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the Service of him that died on the Cross, they should mean no more than that, 'tis a lawful outward Ceremony and honourable Badge, to declare that the Infant has been dedicated to Christ by another outward Ceremony and honourable Badge before. For 'tis evident that the words us'd when the Child is sign'd with the sign of the Cross, do as fully and directly express a proper immediate Dedication as the words us'd when 'tis Baptiz'd, and therefore we have no reason from them to apply so unusual and odd a sense to the words of the Canon, and the Convocations supposing Baptism compleat without the sign of the Cross, does no way Argue that they design'd not a proper renew'd Dedication by the Cross; for tho' we are dedicated by Baptism, yet we properly renew that Dedication as oft as we attend the Lord's Table. And the Romish Church does in their Ritual suppose no more necessary by Divine Right to this Sacrament than we do, and speak of their Ceremonies as only pertaining to the Solemnity of that Sacrament; yet they use several other Rites for proper immediate Dedication, besides that of washing with water.

017. The Cross is made a distinguishing sign of our Chris-
 tian Profession, and the Relation we are thereby in to
 our Father, who is the Father of all who are in Christ.
 For this evidently follows from its being made the
 Inimitable Badge of our Dedication to the Service of a
 crucified Saviour. So that by being cross'd, we are truly
 (according to the establish'd Church) wear the Linen of
 Christ, as by being Baptiz'd. And this former Rite
 and sign is as effectually made the common Symbol and
 Testimony of our Discipleship, the mark of our belonging
 to him as our Lord and Master, as the latter can be.
 11. Now from hence I farther infer, That the Cross
 is made as much a Sacrament as Men can make any
 sign of their own, for which they can produce no Di-
 vine Institution. For let us but look on the same use
 as Baptism, may for such uses as do constitute it a pro-
 per part of positive Worship, that has no stamp of Di-
 vine Authority, and consequently has made a sinful Hu-
 man Invention. For if (as the Bishop himself supposes)
 all ways of Worship are displeasing to God, that are not
 expressly contained in the Holy Scriptures, nor warranted
 by the Examples of Holy Men themselves (as he now adds)
 that cannot be by parity of Reason deduc'd thence; much
 more are all parts of Worship truly displeasing to him,
 (and such as our Saviour justly censures for vain Worship)
 that are not so Instituted. And yet, that all whole
 Rites in Religious Worship, whereby we oblige and bind
 our selves to serve God, (and which is the same) Dedicate
 our selves to his Service, are a proper part of Positive Wor-
 ship, is evident from the Bishop's own confession, who
 (p. 4. of his Discourse) does therefore make the Service
 men are to be in part of outward Worship, and binds on the
 account of our surpassing therein, our dependence on the
 grace of God, but likewise on the account of obliging and
 binding our selves by our service him. And doubtless, it
 does as properly belong to God alone to appoint the
 Religious Rites whereby we bind our selves to his Ser-
 vice, as to the Supreme Magistrate to appoint the Cer-
 monies and Customs taking the Oath of Fidelity and Al-
 legiance. Nay it belongs to him alone to appoint the Ho-
 nourable

nourable Badge of our Discipleship, who receives us into his Holy Covenant, and no inferior Pastors are any more authoriz'd to superadd any other Rite for this use, to that he has Instituted already, than the Servant of any great Prince is warrant'd of his own Head to prescribe to his Fellow-servants the wearing of a new *Levery*, as an Honourable Badge of their belonging to such a Master, besides that which he has appointed of his own choosing. To set up External Rites for such Sacramental uses as these, viz. not only to instruct us in the Priviledges and Duties of the New Covenant, but to oblige and bind us to 'em, and to be the Honourable Badge of our Christian Profession, when God has already instituted other Rites for these very ends, is a piece of Presumption we dare not be guilty of. 'Tis an offering him a part of Worship which has no Stamp of his Authority, which therefore we have no reason to hope he will accept; nay, which there is no shadow of Reason for, if his own Forerat Rites be sufficient for all the ends they are appointed for.

Having thus stated my Argument, I come now to shew the insufficiency of the Bishop's Answer to this Argument. All that I can find, he has directly reply'd to my Argument, is only this; That the whole force of it seems to proceed from two Mistakes concerning the nature of Sacraments: First, As if they were signs from us to God, and not wholly from God to us. Secondly, As if we were to learn the true Nature of Sacraments from the Schools and partial Definitions of interested Disputants, and not from the Holy Scriptures. Hence, saith the Bishop, he has not given us one place of Scripture, to prove his imperfect Account of a Sacrament.

As to this Answer to the Argument, I need do no more for the Refutation of it, than refer the Reader to the foregoing Account of a Sacrament, wherein I fully prov'd concerning Sacraments in general, and particularly that of Baptism, that they are as truly and properly signs from us to God, as from God to us; nay, that they cannot

cannot be the latter without being the former. And this I have prov'd, not from the Dictates of the Schools, but from the *Oracles of God*; having quoted no other *Human Authority* but his own, and I hope he will not reckon himself one of those Partial and Interest'd Disputants he speaks of. So that 'tis not the force of my Argument, but of his Answer, that proceeds from a *Mistake*.

But I suppose his Lordship may lay more stress upon his Account of a Sacrament, and his Application of it to vindicate the *Cross*, which therefore I shall also briefly consider.

To this purpose he acquaints us, 'There are Three things necessary to make up a Sacrament.

First, An outward visible sign instituted by God, signifying some Spiritual Grace we expect from him.

Secondly, An Obligation on God by some Promise of his to grant us that Spiritual Grace or Benefit whenever we duly use the visible Sign.

Thirdly, Our use of this visible Sign without which we are not to expect the Spiritual Benefit if we will fully neglect it.

Accordingly the Bishop thinks me oblig'd to prove that These things concur in the *Cross in Baptism*, viz That the establish'd Church teaches that the *Cross* is instituted by God to signify some Spiritual Grace we expect from him, and that he has oblig'd himself by Promise to grant us that Spiritual Grace upon the use of the *Cross*, and will deprive us thereof if we neglect it.

Now to shew the insufficiency and weakness of this Answer, I need only suggest these two things.

I. The Bishop has in this Account of Sacraments omitted several of those uses and ends for which they were appointed, and particularly those from whence the force of this Argument is deriv'd. For he neither considers their being made *representing* signs to instruct us in the duties of the New Covenant, nor (which should have been chiefly observ'd) their being *obliging* signs to bind us to 'em, nor their being *distinguishing* badges of our Profession and Communion. And yet these are very important

Important uses of these Federal Rites of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, and such as chiefly occasioned their being call'd *Sacraments*.

2. He expects I should prove that which my Argument no way obliges me to, viz. That the established Church teaches, that God has oblig'd himself by Promise to grant us some Spiritual Benefit upon our use of the sign of the *Cross*, and will deny that Benefit to all that neglect that sign. Now tho' he might justly have expected me to prove this, if I had said, That the established Church signs the *Cross* to be a *Sacrament* of God's appointment, and uses it as such; yet 'tis evident from the foregoing Account, that 'tis unreasonable to expect it in what I call a *Human Sacrament*. For when I suppose it made a *Human Sacrament*; I intend no more, then that 'tis made a *Sacrament* as far as Men can make one of a Religious Rite of their own. Now they may make it a sacred Federal Rite to oblige and bind themselves to God's service; tho' 'tis absurd to expect they should make it a Rite to oblige God to confer his Benefits. And their setting it up to this former Sacramental use (as well as other uses aforementioned) is sufficient, as I have shewn him from his own Principles, to make it a sinful *Human Invention*, as every part of Worship is that has no stamp of Divine Authority. So that I can easily allow the Bishop, without any prejudice to my Argument, That to be a Seal of God's part of the Covenant, is so necessary to a true and Divine Sacrament, that what wants that, is but the lifeless Image of one. But Men may presumptuously appoint Rites of their own to so many *Sacramental uses* as shall as truly render 'em Parts of Divine Worship as Divine Sacraments are, tho' they do not suppose God oblig'd to confer his Benefits on all that use them. And by doing so, they set up such vain Worship as our Saviour condemns, as only taught by the Precepts of Men, 15 *Matth.* 8, 9. compar'd with *29 Joh.* 13. So that the Bishop here only cavils at the name of *Human Sacraments*, while he overlooks the plain force and Rites of the Argument, which depends not on the Name

at all, but on the *Uses*, for which the *Cross* is appointed. And I have shew'd 'tis appointed for all but that one that necessarily supposes *Divine Institution*.

But because the *Bishop* now pretends to a *Divine Warrant* for the use of the *Cross* to those purposes for which he supposes it appointed by the *establish'd Church*, 'tis requisite I should consider what he has offer'd on that Head.

II. The *Bishop* undertakes to shew, That the use of the *Cross* in *Baptism* is warranted by *Scripture*.

His Argument to prove this is drawn out to a considerable length, from p. 181. to p. 187. And that I may not wrong him in contracting it, I shall take this method in what I shall offer against it.

First, I shall shew, That the *Bishop's* Argument does not reach the main use of the *Cross*, which he was concern'd to defend.

Secondly, I shall shew that the same Argument will justify many other Rites added by the *Romish Church* to *Baptism*, and other parts of *Worship*, which they have rejected as well as we.

Thirdly, I shall consider the distinct Propositions the *Bishop* has laid down, and shew where I judge the Argument in 'em to be weak and unconvincing.

First, I shall shew that the *Bishop's* Argument does not reach the main use of the *Cross*, which he was concern'd to defend.

For he was chiefly oblig'd to defend the *Cross's* being made a *Dedicating sign*, whereby we bind our selves to the service of *Christ*, and thereby a common distinguishing Badge of our *Christian Profession*; whereas in his Argument he attempts to prove no more, than that the *Scripture* does warrant our using it as an *Instructional sign* to signify or express this particular Duty of our *Glorying in the sufferings of Christ*. Now tho' I do not think he has produc'd us any clear *Scriptural* warrant for this very use of the sign of the *Cross*, yet if he had, what he has laid falls very far short of justifying those two other more important uses of it, which are more peculiar to *Federal* or *Sacramental* Rites, viz.

It's being a Rite of Dedication to the Service of Christ, and thereby the Livery or Badge of the Christian Profession.

Secondly, I shall shew that the Bishop's Argument will serve as well to justify many other Rites which the *Romish Church* has added to *Baptism* and other parts of *Worship*.

As to *Baptism*, a Papist may from the Bishop's Argument draw the following Plea for several other Ceremonies added to it by the *Roman Ritual*; such as the *Priests putting salt into the mouth of the Infant, his anointing his ears and nostrils with spittle, his putting a lighted Taper into the Infants or Godfathers hand, his putting a white Garment on him, &c.*

We are oblig'd (*says the Bishop*) to express the inward sense of our Minds concerning God by outward means, the Scriptures command to express it by our *Actions* as well as *Words*; as to these outward *Actions*, we are to use such as the general Custom of our Country has made significant in the like Cases. Thus because making the sign of the Cross is an *Action*, which universal Custom has applied to signify our glorying in the sufferings of Christ, and 'tis proper to make a Profession of doing so in our *Baptism*, Therefore the Scriptures warrant our use of it in general, and particularly at that time. *Admon. p. 181, 182, 183.*

Since then (may the Papists in *Italy* or *Spain* argue) 'tis our Duty to savour the things of God; To have our Lips season'd with *Wisdom* and *Grace*; To open our Ears to the Doctrine of Christ as becomes his Disciples; To preserve our Garments clean by immaculate Purity of Life, that we may appear faultless before the Tribunal of Christ; To walk in the Light by a blameless observance of our *Baptismal Vows*, that we may with the wise Virgins be admitted to the Heavenly Nuptials; Nay, since 'tis as proper to make a Profession of all this in our *Baptism*, as of *Glorying in the sufferings of Christ*: And since the Scriptures warrant us to make that Profession not only by *Words*, but also by such *Actions* as the Universal custom of our Country has made significant to those Uses, we are thereby

thereby warranted to use all the *Rites* forementioned in the Celebration of *Baptism*, since by the *universal custom of our Country*, they *See Rite Rem.* are applied to signify our obligation to these undoubted Duties of Christianity.

Nay, the Bishop's Argument will go farther: For since 'tis as lawful to profess our *Glorying in the sufferings of Christ* in other parts of Religious Worship as in *Baptism*, and universal custom has applied this Action to signify our doing so, why do we not imitate, instead of blaming the *Papists*, for their so frequently *crossing* themselves in all their Devotions? Or rather, since the *Scriptures command* us to express the inward religious sense of our Minds by *Actions*; nay, since (as the Bishop asserts) *Scripture-Precedents*, not only *warrant* but *oblige* us to use such *actions* as well as *words*, as by universal custom signifies *glorying in the sufferings of Christ*. How come we to lay aside so pious a custom, so commendable, nay so necessary an Expression of our devout respect to a crucified Saviour, which we are not only *warranted* but *oblig'd* to use?

Nay, as the *Romish Church* has in other parts of Divine Worship introduced a great number of *Actions* or *Rites* to express some part or other of our Christian Duty or Devotion, and those *Actions* are rendered significant to that purpose by *universal custom* among those of that Church, 'tis plain by this Argument, that all those *Rites* are warranted by *Scripture*, and our first Reformers seem to have been very unreasonable in their Rejection of 'em. So that this loose way of Reasoning will serve to worse purposes than I hope his Lordship ever design'd it: For it will altogether as well fit the mouth of a *Papist*, for justifying his observance of most of those numerous *Rites* and Ceremonies (or in his Lordship's language, *significant Actions*) which their Church has enjoyn'd, as it does his for justifying the *Cross* in *Baptism*. If the Bishop should pretend that the numberlessness of those *Rites* is the only fault of 'em, he would do well to acquaint us where we may stop, what number of 'em is innocent, and what becomes sinful & excessive.

Thirdly, I come to examine the Propositions the Bishop has laid down for proving the use of the *Cross* in *Baptism* to be warranted by Scripture, and shew wherein I think his Argument in 'em weak and unconvincing.

That we are, according to Proposition the first, to express our inward Reverence or Worship of God by outward Means, such as Praise, Prayer, &c. will be freely granted.

That we are, according to Proposition the second and third, to express that inward Worship in general, by such bodily Gestures, as either nature or civil custom direct us to, and render most fit to represent and testify it to others by, will be also own'd. But I cannot so easily grant, That the Scriptures warrant our expressing the sense of our Minds in all Religious Things or Matters by significant Actions. The particular Duties we owe to God are almost numberless; and if we were warranted by Scripture to express the Thoughts and Sense of our Mind, as to each of 'em, by some significant Rite and Ceremony, the *Romish* Church would be sufficiently authoriz'd by Scripture in her introducing such a load of significant Rites and Ceremonies into Christian Religion, especially if (as the Bishop observes) such significant Actions be more effectual and sincere expressions of the sense of our Minds than words.

Tho' then the Scriptures enjoin Bodily Worship in general, and consequently warrant all such devout Postures as either nature or civil custom has taught us to express it by, as bowing, prostration, kneeling, standing, and (in these parts of the world) the men being uncovered, yet they do not warrant us to contrive distinct significant Actions to express each distinct part of inward Worship, as one to express our Faith in God, another to express our Love to him, another our Hope, another our subjection to his Authority, another our resignation to his disposal, another our dread of his Justice, &c. So tho' we may testify our Worship of Christ as the Incarnate Word, by the forementioned Postures of Devotion,

tion joye: the Scriptures no where waite on our contri-
ving one significant Action or Rite nor expect our Re-
lieving his Gospel; but he to express our Religion on the
virtue of his Merits and Sacrifice; another to signify our
subjection to his Royal Authority; another to dedicate our
glorying in his Cross and Sufferings. Besides the Religious
Postures that are expressive of Worship in general, the
Scriptures require no other External Rites or Signs of
our particular respect to him, besides those of being
Baptiz'd in his Name, and commemorating his Death by
receiving the Bread and Wine in the sacred Memoriall of
it. Therefore,

As to the fourth and fifth Propositions. The first is one
duty to glory in the sufferings of Christ; yet the Scripture
does not warrant (much less oblige us, as the Bishop adds)
to contrive any particular Rite or Ceremony to signify it
any more than to contrive such a Rite to signify our be-
lieve of his Gospel, or dependence on his Abilgation, or sub-
jection to his Government. The Scripture commands our
expressing our inward Worship by Reverence in our
Bodily Postures, and consequently in our Habits.
is to us a Particular included in that general Precept.
But the Scripture no where commands us to signify this
particular Duty of glorying in the sufferings of Christ by
any External Rite, and therefore does not warrant any
particular Rite for that end; for that would have
been to have left a Gap open for bringing in an endless
Train of such significant Rites of our own devising, in-
to Christian Religion; even such as would have made
the Yoke of Christianity as heavy as that of Judaism;
our way as narrow as that of the Jews.

As to the sixth and seventh Propositions, especially fol-
lows from what has been suggested. That is the Scrip-
ture neither obliges nor commands us to observe any Exter-
nal Rite for signifying glorying in the Cross of Christ;
much less does it warrant our use of any Baptism where
there is an External Rite appointed by Christ himself
sufficiently expressive of the whole of our Duty in this
What if the same Authority that set up this very Sign
of the Cross, had appointed *trailing on a material Cross*,

to signify our Faith and Reliance on the Merits of a crucified Saviour; and *kissing a Scepter* to signify our Homage to him as a King, &c. and had introduced these Rites into the Office of Baptism. Could they justly pretend the Scripture warranted them, because it enjoyns Faith in a crucified Saviour, and subjection to him, as our exalted Head and Lord? And yet these would be as *Actions* to signify these Duties, as the making that *acry* sign to express our glorying in the sufferings of Christ. But the Scriptures have given no countenance to such foolish Inventions of our own, nor open'd any such door to our Fancies, which if indulg'd this way, will soon prove very fruitful in such Superstitious Devices; as the Church has learnt by the sad experience of so many Ages, in which the multiplicity of such Rites (as in the Bishop's language, *significans Actiones*) had almost taken out the *Vitality of Religion*.

For the eighth Proposition, I shall consider the particular Instances of such *significant Rites in religious Worship*, for which the Bishop produces Scriptural Precedents, and by which he thinks this Ceremony of *Crossing* is equally warranted.

For that of *Christ's washing his Disciples feet*, because I not see what it should signify to his purpose. For who doubts but Christ might teach his Disciples Humility, by practising before their eyes a custom, but *in this* is most condescending Instance of inquiry, that he might improve that occasion, (as he did almost all occasions) to remind them of the Necessity of being *wash'd in his Blood*, or *purified by his Grace*. But what hath to our appointing a new External Badge of our Dedication to Christ, besides that he has appointed already.

For the second Rite of *Dipping entirely under Water* in Baptism, if the Bp had prov'd both that the words of the Apostle did certainly refer to the Practice of Dipping under Water, assigning this *Spiritual signification* to that particular Rite, And yet that the Christians of that Age had arbitrarily, and without any warrant from Christ or his Apostles, set up this Mode of Baptizing as a religious Rite, to signify their obligation to die to sin, and

live

How is righteousness in conformity to the Flesh and the
 sanctification of Christ, then indeed this Instance had sig-
 nified something to his purpose; but unless it prove both
 these Particulars, it signifies nothing.

And the same Answer may be applied to the next
 Rite, viz: The *Washing of Feet*. He should have first
 prov'd that the Apostles words do certainly refer to such
 a Religious Rite practis'd in Baptism, as signify our
 obligation to put off the old Man, and put on the new;
 and then prov'd this was a Rite merely introduc'd by
 arbitrary custom, without any warrant from Christ.

For if the Apostles expressions refer to these two
 Rites as us'd to these purposes, it will be much more
 reasonable to conclude that they are a part of the *Ordi-*
nance of Baptism; and consequently should still be re-
 tain'd and us'd by us; (unless we suppose that as to the
 former, that Maxim of our Saviour will warrant our
 Omission of it in this colder Climate, *That God will have*
Mercy and not Sacrifice.) And on this supposition the
 Bishop can draw no Argument from hence to his pur-
 pose.

For the *Feast of Charity* and the *Holy Kiss*, I do not
 see that they were Religious Rites at all, but rather real
 Expressions of their mutual Charity. If the richest man
 in a Congregation should on the Lord's Day invite the
 poor to Dinner, this would be such a real instance of
 their Love, (agreeable to our Saviour's advice about
 Feasting, *Luke 14. 12, 13, 14*) as those *Feasts of Cha-*
rity were; but it would be no such *symbol* of their *spirit-*
ual communion as their *Feasting at the Table of the Lord*
 is. And the same may most probably be said of the
Holy Kiss, which being then a common instance of mu-
 tual Respect and Amity among Persons in their *dis-*
ney Assemblies, was therefore innocently continu'd in
 their Religious ones. As no doubt we may there pay
 the same Marks of our Respect and Friendship to each
 other when the Publick Worship is over, that we do on o-
 ther occasions of meeting together. And if we sup-
 pose these two to have been Religious Rites, there will
 be then more reasonable to suppose they had a com-
 mon

rally Institution, than that they had no other warrant than meer arbitrary custom. And upon either of these Suppositions there can be no shew of any Argument drawn from 'em, to prove that the Scripture warrants us to institute a Religious Rite of our own, as an honourable Badge whereby we are dedicated to the service of a crucified Saviour, when Christ himself has instituted one for that use. For this is that which the Bishop was concern'd to produce a scriptural warrant for. And therefore I may justly add here, that tho' the Bishop's Argument had prov'd that the Scriptures warrant us to express our glorying in the sufferings of Christ, by crossing our selves as the Primitive Christians did in their common Conversation, yet this would not prove that they warrant us to use it as a Religious Rite in Baptism for our solemn Dedication to the Service of Christ, because that is a needless doing, that over again by a Rite of our own devising, which is sufficiently done before by a Rite of Christ's Institution. Whereas this is the thing in question, and which to us looks like sinful Presumption.

But before I dismiss the Argument of the Bishop's, 'tis requisite I should consider those two significant Ceremonies among the Dissenters, which he thinks liable to the same Exceptions as the use of the Cross in Baptism, viz. Their giving their Children names at their Baptism, and giving Tickets to Communicants.

For the former significant Ceremony, viz. Of giving names to Children at their Baptism, The Bishop tells us, it signifies their giving up their Names to Christ, and engaging 'em to be his Servants. So that our Names are a lasting Token and Badge to us of our Dedication to the Service of Christ, and an Obligation on us to behave our selves accordingly.

Admon. p. 184. Now I should observe, that the Bishop's Answer. It seems somewhat strange the Bishop should so positively assert, that we give our Children a Name at Baptism for any such purpose as this. For we use it not as any Religious Ceremony at all, much less as an External Sign or Token of giving up their Names to Christ.

and engaging 'em to be his Servants. This is all suggested by his own fancy without any ground; for we know of no other use of this practice in Baptism, then that the Person baptiz'd may be notified to the Congregation, by being call'd by his Name. And for the Bishop's remark on God's giving *Abraham* a new Name at his Circumcision, in allusion to the custom of Masters giving their Servants a new name upon their admission into their Families; besides that, 'tis asserted without any proof, (there being no such reason, but a different one, assign'd by God himself, for changing his Name from *Abram* to *Abraham*, 17 *Gen.* 4, 5.) yet if it were true, I know not what use it can be to his purpose: for if he would infer from it, That this is a Scriptural warrant for giving Names to Children at Baptism, as a Token of their Admission into God's Family, he makes it a significant Ceremony of God's own appointment, and consequently can draw no Argument from it, to justify the use of the Cross as a Ceremony arbitrarily appointed by Men, to signify their Dedication to Christ.

For the other significant Ceremony, which the Bishop saith, the Dissenters have added to the Lord's Supper, and which he desires 'em to reflect on, viz. *Giving of Tickets* to such as are to be admitted thereto. 'Tis, I confess, a very dangerous one, in which he has found out a abundance of very strange and mysterious significations. For in this Ceremony he tells us, 'There is an outward and visible Sign, a Ticket. Secondly, An inward Spiritual Grace, our Aptitude and Title to the Lord's Supper and Communion of Saints, found upon our Examination when we receive the Ticket. Thirdly, 'Tis a Badge and Token whereby priviledg'd Members are distinguished from those that are without. Lastly, 'Tis a sort of necessary Term of Communion, since those that neglect this Badge, shall not be admitted to the Sacrament.

Ans. If all these wonderful spiritual significations assign'd to this poor Ticket prove merely the product of the Bishop's Imagination, then I hope there can be no Argument drawn from it to paragonise the Cross. The Ticket is I confess an outward and visible sign, but I could

never learn before that it was a sign of any thing more, then that the Person that brought it, was allow'd by the Minister to Communicate at that time, and did not intrude there without his permission. But how it should come to signifie a Man's *qualifications* for Receiving, or his *title* to any Spiritual Benefits that belong to worthy Communicants, is very hard to conceive. All that can be said of it is, that 'tis probable the Minister would not have given him leave to Communicate by giving him a Ticket, if he had not known him to be a Member of his *own* or some *other* Congregation. And the Bishop farther mistakes in making the Ticket a Badge to distinguish priviledg'd Members from those that are *without*; for there may be many present as *spectators* at Communions that are *Members*, and have not Tickets at present, because they do not at present *Receive*. Nor would any Man's having a Ticket secure his *Admission*, if he were known to be no Member of *that* or some *other* Congregation. Nay, the Ticket is no necessary Term of Communion neither, since no man that is a noted Member of that, or any other Congregation, would be refus'd, tho' he should have no Ticket, or left it behind him. It's plain, that the giving those Tickets is a circumstance that genuinely falls within the Apostles Rule of *doing all things decently and in order*. Now in such multitudes as in the North of Ireland ordinarily frequent their Communions, there cannot be a more easie and orderly expedient to distinguish the Communicants from meer Spectators, and prevent any Persons from intruding into the Communion of particular Churches without leave, then this of giving Tickets to such as they allow to Receive at that time. So that the general Rule of Scripture foremention'd, does oblige 'em to use this or some other method of the like kind, for the *decent* and *orderly celebration* of that Holy Institution, and preventing the contrary *confusion* and *disorder*. But I hope the Bishop will not pretend that Baptism cannot be *decently* and *orderly* perform'd without using the sign of the Cross, as an Honourable Badge whereby the Person baptiz'd is dedicated to the service of a crucified Saviour, and therefore the Cross is no way warranted by that

that rule of *order* and *decency*, as the forementioned custom evidently is. If indeed this perillous Ticket had had a *Cross* upon it, and the Persons that brought it were order'd to wear it upon their *Breasts* or *Foreheads* as a *sign* whereby they publicly profess their Remembrance of and repewed *Dedication* of themselves to the service of a crucified Saviour, as the *adult* Members of his Church, the Bishop might then have had some pretence to have compar'd these two customs together. But as they are really practis'd, there is no more resemblance between 'em, then between a *prudential* Mode of ordering Christ's own Institution in *general* necessary, and virtually included in his own Rule of order, and an *unnecessary* Religious Rite unwarrantably added by *Men*, to *Christ's* Institution, to some of the same uses as he had appointed another already; and any one that pleases may easily discern a wide difference between these two.

I shall only add here, that as the Bishop has fail'd of producing us any clear Scriptural warrant for the *Cross* (and consequently ought by his own Rule on that very score to discard it as a *Human Invention*), so he has not so much as attempted to vindicate that other *Human Invention* of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers*, set up to exclude the Publick Promise of Parents, for the pious Education of their own Children, and to enter into rash Vows, which few ever perform, which I take to be the more dangerous corruption of the two. See *Remark* p. 167, 168, 169.

As to the Bishop's Conclusion I shall only observe,

1. I do not find that he has made good his Charge of *Human Inventions* against the *Dissenters* in any one particular instance of their Worship, notwithstanding all the assurance wherewith he had asserted, *Diss.* p. 187. That they were so strangely misled as to continue themselves so much together, perhaps for some years with a design so worship God, when one could hardly ever see anything of God's immediate appointment in their Meetings. For this the Bp. there saith was manifestly the case of the *Dissenters* in his thought. And he still takes the same for granted, *Admon.* p. 188. That the worship of *Dissenters* has no express warrant of *Scripture*

Scripture for us. And now to advance so terrible and comprehensive a Charge, and not prove the Truth of it in any one particular Instance, seems to us a very *unadvised*, as well as a very *uncharitable* attempt. Nay, 'tis strange, that (except that of *Crossing*) he has not so much as endeavour'd to vindicate one practice of the established Church from his own Arguments when retorted upon himself.

2. Since the Bishop threatens us, if the Matters of Fact be disputed, to produce his *Vouchers* and *Authorities*, we must now desire him either to do so, or own those Mistakes whereby he has highly injur'd the Reputation of his Brethren. And I hope he will take care that the Testimony of his *Vouchers* be as credible as that of those I have produc'd. And he need not spare to produce 'em out of *renderness* to the *Dissenters* of his *Diocese*, for they desire no other *renderness* in this point, besides that of speaking nothing but Truth of 'em.

3. I think his Caution against the *Remarks* which he here gives very unfair, unless he had prov'd, instead of barely asserting, That my Arguments are not founded on *Scripture*, and that my Answers to his Proofs contradict the Letter of *Scripture*. I hope his Lordship will excuse us, tho' we are unwilling to take all this for granted on no other evidence than his bare word.

Lastly, I hope he will find nothing in these Papers contrary to a *spirit of meekness*, or favouring of *passion*. And tho' the *Dissenters* of his *Diocese*, cannot carry their civility to so high a strain as to thank him for his Book, as he does them for the *entertainment* they have given it, yet they can readily comply with his Request to 'em, Not to be offended with him for telling 'em the truth. For the chief offence they took at his Book, was not his reasoning against their Opinions and Practices, but his giving so untrue an Account of 'em. And therefore they cannot altogether assent to what his Lordship insinuates in these following words: 'Remember nothing is more apt to provoke Mankind than Truth. And if you meet with any Book in Answer to mine, that discovers the writer to have been in a *Passion* when he wrote it, you may
! look

look on it as a probable Argument of the truth of what I have propos'd. And if upon reading what I have wrote, you find any motion in your selves towards Passion, consider well whether it proceed not from the same cause, namely my declaring the truth to you. For they think there is one thing more apt to provoke even the mildest and best of Men, and that is, to be unjustly accus'd to the world, and yet, when the Accuser is admonish'd of his mistakes, to have the Accusation renew'd, and be appeal'd to themselves as Evidences for what they as certainly know to be untrue, as they know their own Judgment and Practice. For in this case they think it no probable Argument of Guilt in the accus'd, if they should express some just displeasure against such ill usage. And yet I hope he will find even this extraordinary provocation has not drawn out any language that looks like *passion*. But yet as the Bp. expects we should allow *plain-dealing* to be a part of his character, so I hope he will not deny us the same liberty of *dealing plainly* with him, not only in vindicating our Opinions and Practices where we think his objections against 'em invalid, but especially in clearing both from such misrepresentations as we think manifestly groundless and injurious, and in desiring an ingenuous Retraction of 'em, as an act which a regard to *Justice* as well as *Truth* should prompt him to. For common *Justice* forbids our ascribing to our Brethren Opinions and Practices which are none of theirs; nay, it forbids our receiving and publishing mistaken Accounts of 'em, from the informations of others, when a little care and diligence might have enabled us to discover the falsehood of 'em. And consequently the same Principle should prompt us to do right to the Reputation of our Brethren, when we have, thro' our unwary credulity, or in the heat of opposition spoken or written of 'em what is not true, and yet what if believ'd, would tempt others to very unjust and uncharitable apprehensions of their Judgment and Practice. And when his Lordship has given the Dissenters of his Diocese this evidence of his *Justice* towards 'em, they will then be more ready to believe his *sincerity* in studying their good.

And

And now if these Papers contribute any thing to reconcile his Land those whom his Book and *Minimition* may have misled, to more charitable thoughts of our Worship, and to caution us in such Debates as this to be more strict in observing that excellent Rule of the Apostles, *To speak the truth in love*, Eph. 4:15. I shall not think my pains in writing 'em wholly lost. For tho' in the Matters in dispute between us, it becomes every good man as to his own practice, to adhere impartially to the rule of the Holy Scriptures as far as he understands; yet nothing is more plain, than that those great Truths and Duties of Christianity wherein we are agreed, are of incomparably greater moment and importance than those wherein we differ. And as 'tis our unity in those most important Truths and Duties that chiefly recommends us to the acceptance of our blessed Lord; so that alone is sufficient to endear us to one another; and for those smaller Differences almost us that are so fully consistent with a happy Unity in these essentials of our Religion, however they may now distinguish us into Parties, yet they can never be reasonably thought to exclude the Churches on either side from the Communion of the Church Catholick, much less will they exclude the truly pious Members on either side from the Heavenly Society. How little then should those Differences tend to disunite our affections; or to obstruct our amicable endeavours to advance the common Interest of *Practical Holiness*? how should we rejoice to see that blessed work prosper in each others hands? how entirely should Charity govern all our debates in the points wherein we disagree, and make us unwilling to misrepresent each others opinions or practices, when we calmly reason against 'em? how strongly should it prompt us to treat each other in all respects as brethren, in whom we behold the image of our great Master stamp'd, tho' we may not see the inscription of this or that party, which we judge to be the most happily reform'd, or the best constituted and modell'd? how much more zealous should we be to *praise* Men to the substance and power of Religion, than to any external *Modes* of Worship and Discipline? And how heartily should we joy in that apostolic Benediction, *Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*, Amen. 6 Eph. 24.

Mr,

Mr. Simons's Letter referred to p. 14. and 1

SIR,

The Argumentative and Historical parts of the Bishop of Derry's Admonition, form both of a piece as would many apparent mistakes in 'em. A satisfactory Answer to the former is justly expected from your self. But for the latter, as it is necessary to make use of the Information of others; who, I am confident, will be more faithful to you than the Bishop's Informers have been to him: so I shall readily comply with your desire, to give a true and certain account of the practices of Dissenters in Waterford before the late Troubles; which was so very different from what his Lordship gives, when he says, p. 30. He had opportunity to enquire, and was told they did not Communicate above once a year, if so often: That (as he hath said in the former page) we may thence conclude the probability of what he says concerning others.

This account I'm more concerned and better enabled to give you with greater assurance, because I preached 39 Years in that time; and have also carefully preserved a Memorial of such things in my Diary, which are as followeth.

I was Ordain'd a Pastor to that People about 2 year and a half before the Troubles, and administered the Eucharist Supper Six times in thirteen Months of that time, viz. Decemb: 18. 1687. May 6. 1688. July 7. 88. Oct: 20. 88. Jan: 27. 88. besides four times more I administered that Sacrament the same year to another Congregation, that was supplied by some neighbouring Ministers and myself. And I can assure you, that those Ministers gave the Communion more frequently, most of 'em once a Month, some of 'em once in two Months to their own Congregations.

But that I may conceal nothing from you, that the Bishop's Information may possibly be supposed to reach, I shall acquaint you, that the the Dissenters in Waterford both before & since among 'em; and while I preached to 'em only as a Candidate had no fixed Pastor, yet even then they had the Communion administered to 'em often than once a year, by some of the aforesaid Ministers: that it is with them for that end, and many of the People and also to Communicate frequently with those Ministers in their own Congregations.

I shall further suggest to you, that the reason of my preaching to 'em for some time as a Candidate only, was the excessive discouragement I was with them from the severities of some that call'd themselves Protestants, for we were frequently disturb'd in our publick worship, and 6 times forc'd to change the place of our Meeting: the best part of the Auditory was for a whole Sabbath detain'd prisoners by armed men, and towards evening I was convey'd by a strong Guard thro' a throng of Papists, who rejoic'd to see Protestants doing that drudgery for 'em, and several times besides that, I was brought before the Magistrate, and instead of being accused, was only revild and threatened. But at last they attempted, the common practice of that time, to accuse me of Plots, and when they were shamefully disappointed, and vented their rage against me, the then Mayor hardly rescued me from 'em. But soon after another Mayor succeeded, who was for their purpose, and join'd with some of 'em to persecute me after this manner: The Military Governour rudely assulted main in the Mayor's house (where I came to see some friends take horse, for he kept a publick Inn), and dragg'd me into the streets, where the Soldiers receiv'd me, the rude Officers pull'd off my Hat, and forc'd me to go bare-headed thro' the chief parts of the City, with two Drums, taboring before me, till they sent me over the River, with a threatening Message to the Inns on the other side, if they should dare to entertain me. They forc'd me to complain to the L. Clarendon then L. Lieutenant, who being fully convinc'd of my Persecutors malice, and the miseries I had suffer'd gave his Order, that I should return peaceably to my habitation, and be safely protectid in it. And having then some hope of ease from the violence of my adversaries, I accepted the call of the people, and was Ordain'd among 'em by some of the neighbouring Ministers, and administered the Communion for the time. I continued with 'em as above-mention'd, and I am assur'd that the same Congregation hath the Sacrament administr'd to 'em 6 times a year by their present Pastor Mr. Cock. That I judge sufficient to vindicate our practice from what we are accus'd of, and being a Matter of Fact so generally known, I could produce many witnesses (if it were needful) to confirm the Testimony of.

Sir, your Affectionate Brother and Servant,

Alexander Sinclair.

THE CONTENTS.

The Bishop's Introduction consider'd,	p. 1.
His Three Heads examin'd,	p. 1.
1. That relating to the Motives of writing his Book,	p. 4. to 7.
from	
2. That relating to the Concessions made in the Remarks,	p. 7. to 9.
3. That relating to Matters of Fact, from	p. 8. to 37.
His other Exceptions against the Remarks consider'd,	
Two relating to the Author examin'd,	p. 37. to 40.
That relating to the Rule of Worship which the Bishop pretends to be laid down in the Remarks answer'd from	p. 40. to 48.
His Exception against the Requests offer'd to the Conf. Clergy Answer'd, from	p. 48. to 53.
His Exceptions relating to what the Remarks object against the Cross in Baptism.	
The Bishop's Objections against the Directory in reference to Baptism, consider'd from	p. 53. to 56.
The Argument propos'd in the Remarks against the Cross, more fully stated, from	p. 58. to 73.
The Bishop's Answer to this Argument examin'd,	p. 73. to 76.
The Bishop's Argument to prove the use of the Cross in Baptism warranted by Scripture, answer'd from	p. 76. to 86.
Remarks on the Bishop's Conclusion.	
Mr. Sinclair's Letter concerning the Practice of Dissenters in <i>Waterford</i> , as to the frequency of their Communions.	

POST.

POSTSCRIPT.

W Hereas the Bishop, Admon. p. 69. asserts, That some, who have been found unqualified and insufficient for Learning by them, are receiv'd as Preachers among the Dissenters, after being rejected by them. And adds, That he has a notorious Example thereof since he came to this Diocese. The Dissenting Ministers of his Diocese Declare they know of no such Person. And if the Bishop (as there is some ground to conjecture) mean Mr. Sq. he declares he was never Examined as to his Learning by them; and (besides that, he is no Preacher in that part of the Kingdom) most that know him, think that if his Lordship should reject all those of his Clergy that are not Mr. Sq.'s Superiours in Learning, he must exclude a great many of those that are now in his Diocese.

FINIS

